National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. | Without Concealment---Without Compromise. | EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } Corresponding Editors.

VOL. X.---NO. 41. | NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 1850. | WHOLE NUMBER 509.

Published Weekly,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY,
At 142 Nassau Street, New-York.

Terms.
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. Gay, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. Gay, New-York.

NORRIS, PRINTER.

Selections.

SPEECH OF HON. HENRY CLAY.

(CONCLUDED.)

It originated in this body, as those who will cast their recollection back, and I am sure the honorable Senator from Missouri, (Mr. Benton,) more correctly than anybody else, must bring to his recollection the fact that at the Congress when the proposition was first made to admit Missouri—or rather to allow her to hold a convention and frame a constitution and decide whether she should or should not be admitted into the Union—the bill failed by a disagreement between the two Houses, the House insisting on, and the Senate dissenting from the provisions contained in the Ordinance of 1787. The House insisting on the interdiction of Slavery, and the Senate rejecting the proposition of the introduction of Slavery, the bill fell through; it did not pass at that session of Congress. At the next session it was renewed, and at the time of its renewal Maine was knocking at our door to be admitted into the Union. In the House there was a majority for the restriction as to Slavery in Missouri: in the Senate there was a majority opposed to all restriction. In the Senate, therefore, in order to carry through the Missouri bill, or the provision for her admission—or rather authorizing her to determine the question of her admission—that bill was coupled with the bill for the admission of Maine. They were connected together, and the Senate said to the House, "You want a bill for the admission of Maine passed, but you shall not have it, unless you take along with it a bill for the admission of Missouri also." There was a majority, a very large one, in the Senate, for coupling both together.

Well, sir, the bill went through all the usual stages of disagreement of committees of conference, and and there were two committees of conference on the occasion before the matter was finally settled. And it was finally settled to disconnect the two bills—to admit Maine separately, without any connection with Missouri, and to insert in the Missouri bill a clause proposed in the Senate of the United States by Mr. Thomas, Senator from Illinois, restricting Slavery north of the line 36 deg. 30 min. and leaving it open south of that line, either to admit it or not to admit it. Well, sir, the bill finally passed. The committees of conference of the two Houses recommended the detachment of the two cases, and the passage of the Missouri bill with the clause 36 deg. 30 min., in it: and so it passed, so it went to Missouri, so it for a moment quieted the country, by means of the introduction of the clause 36 deg. 30 min. You will find, I repeat, sir, if you will take the trouble to look at the journals, that on as many as three or four different occasions Mr. Thomas in every instance presented the proposition of 36 deg. 30 min. It was finally agreed to; and I take occasion to say that among those who voted for the 36 deg. 30 min. were the majority of the Southern members—my friend from Alabama, (Mr. King,) in the Senate, Mr. Pinckney, from Maryland, and indeed the majority of the Southern Senators voted in favor of the line 36 deg. 30 min., and the majority of the Southern members in the other house, at the head of whom was Mr. Lowndes himself, voted also for that line. I have no doubt I did also; but, as I was Speaker of the House at this time, and the journal does not show how the Speaker votes except in the case of a tie, I was not able to ascertain, by a resort to the records, how I did vote; but I have very little doubt that I voted, in common with my other Southern friends, for the adoption, in a spirit of compromise, it is true, of the line 36 deg. 30 min.

Well, sir, so the matter ended in 1820. During that year Missouri held her convention, adopted her constitution, sent her delegates to Congress, seeking to be admitted into the Union; but she had inserted a clause in her constitution containing a prohibition of free people of color from that State. She came here with her constitution containing that prohibition, and immediately the Northern members took exception to it. The flame which had been repressed during the previous session now burst forth with double violence throughout the whole Union. Legislative bodies all got in motion to keep out Missouri, in consequence of her interdiction of free people of color from within her limits. I did not arrive at Congress that session till January, and when I got here I found both bodies completely paralyzed in consequence of the struggle to exclude Missouri from the Union on account of that prohibition.

Well, sir, I made the first effort in the House to settle it. I asked for a committee of thirteen, and a committee of thirteen was granted to me, representing all the old States of the Union. The committee met. I presented to them a resolution, which was adopted by the committee and reported to the House—not unlike the one to which I will presently call the attention of the Senate—and we should have carried it in the House but for the votes of Mr. Randolph, of Virginia, Mr. Edwards, of North Carolina, and Mr. Burton, of North Carolina—two of the three, I believe, are no longer living. These three Southern votes were all cast against the compromise which was prepared by the committee, or rather by myself, as chairman of the committee of thirteen, and defeated it.

Well, sir, in that condition the thing remained for several days. The greatest anxiety pervaded the country—the public mind was unsettled—men were unhappy—there was a large majority of the House then, as I hope and trust there is now a large majority in Congress, in favor of an equitable accommodation or settlement of the question; and the resolution would have been adopted, I believe, but when it came to the vote of yeas and nays, unfortunately then—more unfortunately then, I hope, than now, if there should be occasion for it now—there were few Curtiuses and Leonidases willing to risk themselves for the safety and security of their country. I endeavored to avail myself of that good feeling, as far as I could; and, after a few days elapsed, I brought forward another proposition; a new one, perfectly unpractised in this country, either before or since, so far as I know.

I proposed a joint committee of the two houses; that of the House to consist of twenty-three members, (the number of the Senate Committee I do not recollect,) and that this committee should be appointed by ballot; for at that time Mr. Taylor, of New York, was in the chair, and Mr. Taylor was the very man who had first proposed the restriction upon Missouri. He proposed that she should only be admitted on the principle of the Ordinance of 1787; I proposed therefore, that the committee be appointed by ballot. Well, sir, my motion was carried by a large majority; and members came to me from all quarters of the House, and said, "Whom, Mr. Clay, do you want to have with you on the committee?" I made out my list of twenty-three members, and I venture to say that that happened on that occasion which will hardly ever happen again, eighteen of the twenty-three were elected on the first ballot, and the remaining five on my list having the largest number of votes, but not the majority, I moved to dispense with any further balloting, and that these five should be added to the eighteen, thus completing the committee of twenty-three. One or two gentlemen, Mr. Livermore, of New Hampshire, and one or two others, declined to serve on the committee; and, very much to my regret, and somewhat to my annoyance, the lamented Mr. Randolph and another person were placed in their situation—I forget whether done by ballot or by the Speaker; it is enough to say they were put on the committee.

Well, sir, the Senate immediately agreed to the proposition, appointed its committee, and we met in this hall on the Sabbath day, within two or three days of the close of the session, when the whole nation was waiting with breathless anxiety for some final and healing measure upon the distracting subject which occupied our attention. We met here on that day, and, accordingly, the moment we met, Mr. Randolph made a suggestion which I knew would be attended with the greatest embarrassment and difficulty. He contended that over the two committees of the two houses the chairman of the House committee had a right to preside, and he was about to insist at some length that the two committees should be blended together, and that I should preside over both. I instantly interposed, and said that I did not think that was the correct mode, but that the chairman of the committee of each house should preside over his own committee, and that when the committee of one house matured and adopted a proposition, it should be summitted to the other committee, and if agreed to by them, it should then be reported to the two houses, and its adoption recommended. That course was agreed upon, and Mr. Holmes, I believe, of Maine, presided over the committee of the Senate, and I presided over the committee of the House. I did, then, what I have protested I would not do at this session—took too much the lead in the discussion.

I brought forward the proposition which I will refer to presently: and I did more, I took the trouble to ascertain the views of each member of the committee—I polled the committee, if I may use the expression. I said, now, gentlemen, we do not want a proposition carried here by a simple majority and reported to the House, there to be rejected. I am for something practical, something conclusive, something decisive upon this agitating question, and it should be carried by a good majority. How will you vote Mr. A? how will you vote, Mr. B? how will you vote Mr. C? and I polled them in that way. Well, sir, to my very great happiness, a sufficient number responded affirmatively, that they would vote for the proposition, to enable me to know that, if they continued to vote that way in the two houses, of which I had not a particle of doubt in the world, the proposition would be carried in the two houses. Accordingly, it having been agreed upon by both committees, and reported to their respective houses, it was finally adopted.

The joint resolution for the admission of Missouri was passed in 1821. (I find I have been furnished with one which was proposed, but not adopted. The right one is contained in the statutes at large; I have seen it there.

Well, sir, the resolution was finally adopted. I can state, without reading it, what its provisions are. It declares that, if there be any provision in the Constitution of Missouri, incompatible with the Constitution of the United States, Missouri shall forbear to enforce the repugnant provisions of her constitution, and that she shall by some solemn and authentic act declare that she, will not enforce any provisions of her constitution which are incompatible with the Constitution of the United States; and upon her passage of such a solemn and authentic act, the President of the United States—who was at that time Mr. Monroe—shall make proclamation of the fact; and thereupon, and without any farther legislation of Congress, Missouri shall be admitted into the Union.

Now, sir, I want to call your attention to this period of history, and to the transactions which took place during the progress of the discussion upon the resolution.

During the discussion which took place in the House at that time, from day to day, and from night to night—for the discussions frequently ran into the night—we who were for admitting Missouri into the Union said to our brethren from the North, "We are willing, as the condition of admitting Missouri into the Union, that there be any provision in the Constitution of Missouri which is repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, it is a nullity. The Constitution of the United States, by virtue of its own operation—its own self-operation—vacates it. Any tribunal on earth, before which the question may be brought, must pronounce the Constitution of the United States paramount, and must pronounce invalid the repugnant provisions of the Constitution of Missouri." Well, sir, the argument was turned, and twisted, and used in every possible variety of form. All was in vain. An inflexible majority stood out to the last against the admission of Missouri; and yet the resolution—

Mr. Underwood. I have it here.

Mr. Clay. If you will read it, I shall be obliged to you.

Mr. Underwood read the resolution as follows:

Resolution providing for the admission of the State of Missouri into the Union on a certain condition.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Missouri shall be admitted into this Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever, upon the fundamental condition that the fourth clause of the 26th section of the third article of the Constitution, submitted on the part of said state to Congress, shall never be construed to authorize the passage of any law, and that no law shall be passed in conformity thereto, by which any citizen of either of the States of this Union shall be excluded from the enjoyment of any of the privileges and immunities to which such citizen is entitled under the Constitution of the United States: *Provided*, That the Legislature of the said state, by a solemn public act, shall declare the assent of the said State to the said fundamental condition, and shall transmit to the President of the United States, on or before the fourth Monday in November next, an authentic copy of the said act; upon the receipt whereof the President, by proclamation, shall announce the fact; whereupon, and without any farther proceeding on the part of Congress, the admission of the said State into the Union shall be considered as complete.

[Approved March 2, 1832.]

Mr. Clay. This is the resolution, sir, and you see it is precisely what I have stated. After all this excitement throughout the country, reaching to such an alarming point that the Union itself was supposed to be in the most imminent peril and danger, the parties were satisfied by the declaration of an incontestable principle of Constitutional law, that when the Constitution of a State is violative in its provisions of the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the United States is paramount, and the Constitution of the State in that particular is a nullity and void. That was all. They wanted something as a justification, and this appeared, at least, a justification of the course they took. There is a great deal of language there of a high-sounding character—that it shall be a fundamental act, a solemn act, an authentic act; but, after all, when you come to strip it of its verbiage, it is nothing but the announcement of the principle that the Constitution of the United States is paramount over the local constitution of any one of the States of the Union.

Mr. President, I may draw from that transaction in our history which we are now examining, this moral; that now, as then, if we will only suffer our reason to have its scope and sway, and to still and hush the passion and excitement that has been created by the occasion, the difficulty which will be more than half removed, in the settlement, upon just and amicable principles, of any questions which unhappily divide us at this moment.

But, sir, I wish to contrast the plan of accommodation which is proposed by me with that which is offered by the Missouri compromise line being extended to the Pacific ocean, and to ask of gentlemen from the South, and gentlemen from the North, too, which is most proper, which is most just, and to which there is the least cause of objection.

Now, sir, what was done by the Missouri line? Slavery was positively interdicted North of that line. The question of the mission or exclusion of Slavery south of that line was was settled. There was no provision that Slavery should be introduced or established south of that line. In point of fact, it existed in all the territory south of the line of 36 deg. 30 min., embracing Arkansas and Louisiana. It was not necessary then, it is true, to insert a clause admitting Slavery at that time. But, sir, if there is a power to interdict, there is a power to admit; and I put it to gentlemen from the South, are they prepared to be satisfied with the line of 36 deg. 30 min., interdicting Slavery to the North of it, and giving them no guaranty for the possession of Slavery south of that line? The honorable Senator from Mississippi told us the other day that he was not prepared to be satisfied with that compromise line. He told us, if I understood him rightly, that nothing short of a positive introduction——

Mr. Foote. Recognition.

Mr. Clay. That nothing short of a positive recognition of Slavery south of the line of 36 deg. 30 min. would satisfy him. Well, is there any body who believes that you could get twenty votes in this body, or a proportional number in the other House, to a declaration in favor of the recognition of Slavery south of the line 36 deg. 30? It is impossible. All that you can get, all that you can expect to get, all that was proposed at the last session, was action on the north of the line, and non-action as regards Slavery south of that line. It is interdicted on one side, without any corresponding provision for its admission on the other side of the line of 36 deg. 30 min.

Now, sir, when I came to consider the subject, and to compare the provisions of the like of 36 deg. 30 min.—the Missouri compromise line—with the plan which I propose for the accommodation of this question, what said I to myself? Why, if I offer the line of 36 deg. 30 min., interdicting Slavery north of it, and leaving the question open south of that line, I offer that which is illusory to the north; I offer that which will deceive them, if they suppose that Slavery will be introduced south of that line. It is better for them, I said to myself—it is better for the whole South, that there should be non-action on both sides, than that there should be action interdicting Slavery on one side, without action for the admission of Slavery on the other side of the line. Is it not so? What, then, is gained by the South, if the Missouri line is extended to the Pacific, with an interdiction of Slavery north of it? Why, sir, one of the very arguments which have been most often and most seriously urged by the South has been this, that we do not want you to legislate upon the subject at all; you ought not to touch it; you have no power over it. I do not concur, as is well known from what I have said upon this occasion, in this view of the subject. But that is the southern argument. We do not want you to legislate at all on the subject of Slavery; but if you adopt the Missouri line and extend it to the Pacific, and interdict Slavery north of that line, you do legislate upon the subject of Slavery, and you legislate without a corresponding equivalent of legislation on the subject of Slavery south of the line. For, if there be legislation interdicting Slavery north of the line, the principle of equality would require that there should be legislation admitting Slavery south of the line.

Sir, I have said that I never could vote for it, and I repeat that I never can, and never will vote for it; and no earthly power shall ever make me vote to plant Slavery where Slavery does not exist. Still, if there be a majority—and there ought to be such a majority—for interdicting Slavery north of the line, there ought to be an equal majority—if equality and justice be done to the South—to admit Slavery south of the line. And if there be a majority ready to accomplish both of these purposes, though I cannot concur in the action, yet I would be one of the last to create any disturbance, I would be one of the first to acquiesce in such legislation, though it is contrary to my own judgment and my own conscience. I think, then, it would be better to keep the whole of these territories untouched by any legislation of Congress on the subject of Slavery, leaving it open, undecided, without any action of Congress in relation to it; that it would be best for the South, and best for all the views which the South has, from time to time, disclosed to us as corresponding with its wishes.

I know it may be said with regard to these ceded territories, as it is said with regard to California, that non-legislation implies the same thing as the exclusion of Slavery. That we cannot help. That Congress is not reproachable for. If nature has pronounced the doom of Slavery upon those territories—if she has declared, by her immutable laws, that Slavery cannot and shall not be introduced there, whom can you reproach but nature or nature's God? Congress you cannot; Congress abstains; Congress is passive; Congress is non-active in regard to the subject of Slavery south and north of the line; or rather Congress, according to the plan which proposes to extend no line, leaves the entire theatre of these territories untouched by legislative enactment, either to exclude or admit Slavery.

Well, sir, I ask again—if you will listen to the voice of calm and dispassionate reason—I ask of any man from the South to rise and tell me if it is not better for his section of the Union that Congress should remain passive, on both sides of any ideal line, than that it should interdict Slavery on one side of the line and be passive in regard to it on the other side of the line.

Sir, I am taxing both the physical and intellectual power which a kind Providence has bestowed upon me, too much—too much by far—though I beg to be permitted, if the Senate will have patience with me, to conclude what I have to say, for I do not desire to trespass another day upon your time and patience, as I am approaching, though I have not nearly arrived at, the conclusion.

Mr. Mangum. If the Senator will permit me, I will move an adjournment.

Mr. Clay. No sir, no; I will conclude. I think I can get on better to-day than I shall be able to do if the subject be postponed.

Sir, this Union is threatened with subversion. I want, Mr. President, to take a very rapid glance at the course of public measures in this Union presently. I want, however, before I do that, to ask the Senate to look back upon the career which this country has run since the adoption of this constitution down to the present day. Was there ever a nation upon which the sun of heaven has shone that has exhibited so much of prosperity? At the commencement of this Government our population amounted to about four millions; it has now reached upward of twenty millions. Our territory was limited chiefly and principally to the border upon the Atlantic ocean, and that which includes the southern shores of the interior lakes of our country.

Our country now extends from the Northern provinces of Great Britain to the Rio Grande and the Gulf of Mexico on one side, and from the Atlantic ocean to the Pacific on the other side—the largest extent of territory under any Government that exists on the face of the earth, with only two solitary exceptions. Our tonnage, from being nothing, has risen in magnitude and amount so as to rival that of the nation who has been proudly characterized "the mistress of the ocean." We have gone through many wars—wars too with the very nation from whom we broke off in 1776, as weak and feeble colonies, and asserted our independence as a member of the family of nations. And, sir, we came out of that struggle, unequal as it was—armed as she was at all points, in consequence of just having come out of her long struggles with other European nations, and unarmed as we were at all points, in consequence of the habits and nature of our country and its institutions—we came, as I say, out of that war without any loss of honor whatever—we emerged from it gloriously.

In every Indian war—and we have been engaged in many of them—our armies have triumphed; and without speaking at all as to the causes of the recent war with Mexico, whether it was right or wrong, and abstaining from any expression of opinion as to the justice or propriety of the war, when once commenced all must admit that, with respect to the gallantry of our armies, the glory of our triumphs, there is no page or pages of history which record more brilliant successes. With respect to one commander of an important portion of our army I need say nothing here; no praise is necessary in behalf of one who has been elevated by the voice of his country to the highest station she could place him in, mainly on account of his glorious military career. And of another, less fortunate in many respects than some other military commanders, I must take the opportunity of saying, that for skill, for science, for strategy, for ability and daring fighting, for chivalry of individuals and of masses, that portion of the American army which was conducted by the gallant Scott, as the chief commander, stands unrivalled either by the deeds of Cortez himself, or by those of any other commander in ancient or modern times.

Sir, our prosperity is unbounded—nay, Mr. President, I sometimes fear that it is in the wantonness of that prosperity that many of the threatening ills of the moment have arisen. Wild and erratic schemes have sprung up throughout the whole country, some of which have even found their way into legislative halls; and there is a restlessness existing among us which I fear will require the chastisement of Heaven to bring us back to a sense of the immeasurable benefits and blessings which have been bestowed upon us by Providence. At this moment—with the exception of here and there a particular department in the manufacturing business of the country—all is prosperity and peace, and the nation is rich and powerful. Our country has grown to a magnitude, to a power and greatness, such as to command the respect, if it does not awe the apprehensions, of the powers of the earth, with whom we come in contact.

Sir, do I depict with colors too lively the prosperity which has resulted to us from the operations of this Union? Have I exaggerated in any particular her power, her prosperity, or her greatness? And now, sir, let me go a little into detail with respect to sway in the councils of the nation, whether from the North or the South, during the sixty years of unparalleled prosperity that we have enjoyed. During the first twelve years of the administration of the Government Northern counsels rather prevailed; and out of them sprang the Bank of the United States, the assumption of the State debts, bounties to the fisheries, protection to our domestic manufactures—I allude to the act of 1789—neutrality in the wars of Europe, Jay's treaty, the alien and sedition laws, and war with France. I do not say, sir, that these, the leading and prominent measures which were adopted during the administrations of Washington and the elder Adams, were carried exclusively by Northern counsels—they could not have been—but mainly by the ascendancy which Northern counsels had obtained in the affairs of the nation. So, sir, of the latter period—for the last fifty years.

I do not mean to say that Southern counsels alone have carried the measures which I am about to enumerate. I know they could not exclusively have carried them, but I say that they have been carried by their preponderating influence, with the coöperation, it is true—the large coöperation in some instances—of the Northern section of the Union. And what are those measures? During that fifty years, or nearly that period, in which Southern counsels have preponderated, the embargo and other commercial restriction of non-intercourse and non-importation were imposed; war with Great Britain the Bank of the United States overthrown, protection enlarged and extended to domestic manufactures—I allude to the passage of the act of 1815 or 1816—the Bank of the United States reëstablished, the same bank put down, reëstablished by Southern counsels and put down by Southern counsels, Louisiana acquired, Florida bought, Texas annexed, war with Mexico, California and other terrritories acquired from Mexico by conquest and purchase, protection superseded, and free trade established, Indians removed West of the Missisippi, and fiifteen new States admitted into the Union. It is very possible, sir, that in this enumeration I may have omitted some of the important measures which have been adopted during this latter period of time—the last fifty years—but these I believe to be the most prominent ones.

Now, sir, I do not deduce from the enumeration of the measures adopted by the one side or the other any just cause of reproach either upon one side or the other; though one side or the other has predominated in the two periods to which I have referred. These measures were, to say the least, the joint work of both parties, and neither of them have any just cause to reproach the other. But, sir, I must say, in all kindness and candor, that the conduct of the South to reproach the North, when we look at the long list of measures which, under her sway in the counsels of the nation, have been adopted; when we reflect that even opposite doctrines have been from time to time advanced by her; that the establishment of the Bank of the United States, which was done under the administration of Mr. Madison, met with the coöperation of the South—I do not say the whole South—I do not, when I speak of the South or the North, speak of the entire of either; I speak of the prominent and larger proportion of Southern and Northern men. It was during Mr. Madison's administration that the Bank of the United States was established. My friend, whose sickness—which I very much deplore—prevents us from having his attendance upon this occasion, (Mr. Calhoun,) was the chairman of the committee, and carried the measure through Congress. I voted for it with all my heart. Although I had been instrumental with other Southern votes in putting down the Bank of the United States, I changed my opinion and coöperated in the establishment of the Bank of 1816. The same bank was again put down by Southern counsels, with General Jackson at their head, at a later period.—Again, with respect to the policy of protection. The South in 1815—I mean the prominent Southern men, the lamented Lowndes, Mr. Calhoun, and others—united in extending a certain measure of protection to domestic manufactures as well as the North.

We find a few years afterward the South interposing most serious objections to this policy, and one member of the South, threatening on that occasion, a dissolution of the Union or separation. Now, sir, let us take another view of the question—and I would remark that all these views are brought forward not in a point of reproach, but of conciliation—not to provoke, or exasperate, but to quiet, to produce harmony and repose, if possible. What have been the territorial acquisitions made by this country, and to what interests have they conduced? Florida, where Slavery exists, has been introduced; Louisiana, or all the most valuable part of that State—for although there is a large extent of territory north of the line 36 deg. 30 min., in point of intrinsic value and importance, I would not give the single State of Louisiana for the whole of it—all Louisiana, I say, with the exception of that which lies north of 36 deg. 30 min., including Oregon, to which we obtained title mainly on the ground of its being a part of the acquisition of Louisiana; all Texas; all the territories which have been acquired by the Government of the United States during its sixty years operation have been slave territories, the theatre of Slavery, with the exception that I have mentioned of that lying north of the line of 36 deg. 30 min.

And here, in the case of a war made essentially by the South—growing out of the annexation of Texas, which was a measure proposed by the South in the councils of the country, and which led to the war with Mexico—I do not say all of the South, but the major portion of the South pressed the annexation of Texas upon the country—that measure, as I have said, led to the war with Mexico, and the war with Mexico led to the acquisition of those territories which now constitute the bone of contention between the different members of the Confederacy. And now, sir, for the first time, when three great acquisitions of Texas, Florida, and Louisiana have been made and have redounded to the benefit of the South—now, for the first time, when three territories are attempted to be introduced without the institution of Slavery, I put it to the hearts of my countrymen of the South, if it is right to press matters to the disastrous consequences which have been indicated no longer ago than this very morning, on the occasion of the presentation of certain resolutions—even extending to a dissolution of the Union. Mr. President, I cannot believe it.

Mr. Underwood. Will the Senator give way for an adjournment?

Mr. Clay. Oh, no; if I do not weary the patience of the Senate, I prefer to go on. I think I can see land. I shall soon come to the conclusion of what I have to say. Such is the Union, and such are the glorious fruits which are now threatened with subversion and destruction. Well, sir, the first question which naturally arises, is, supposing the Union to be dissolved for any of the causes or grievances which are complained of, how far will dissolution furnish a remedy for those grievances? If the Union is to be dissolved for any existing cause, it will be because Slavery is interdicted or not allowed to be introduced into the ceded territories; or because Slavery is threatened to be abolished in the District of Columbia; or because fugitive slaves are not restored, as in my opinion they ought to be, to their masters.—These, I believe, would be the causes, if there be any causes which can lead to the dreadful event to which I have referred. Let us suppose the Union dissolved; what remedy does it, in a severed state, furnish for the grievances complained of in its united condition? Will you be able at the South to push Slavery into the ceded territory? How are you to do it, supposing the North, or all the States north of the Potomac, in possession of the navy and army of the United States? Can you expect, I say, under these circumstances, that if there is a dissolution of the Union you can carry Slavery into California and New Mexico? Sir, you cannot dream of such an occurrence.

If it were abolished in the District of Columbia and the Union were dissolved, would the dissolution of the Union restore Slavery in the District of Columbia? Is your chance for the recovery of your fugitive slaves safer in a state of dissolution or of severance of the Union than when in the Union itself?—Why, sir, what is the state of the fact? In the Union you lose some slaves and recover others; but here let me revert to a fact which I ought to have noticed before, because it is highly creditable to the courts and juries of the free States. In every instance, as far as my information extends, in which an appeal has been made to the courts of justice to recover penalties from those who have assisted in decoying slaves from their masters; in every instance, as far as I have heard, the courts have asserted the rights of the owner, and the jury has promptly returned an adequate verdict on his behalf. Well, sir, there is then some remedy while you are a part of the Union for the recovery of your slaves, and some indemnification for their loss. What would you have, if the Union was severed? Why, then the several parts would be independent of each other, foreign countries, and slaves escaping from one to the other would be like slaves escaping from the U. States to Canada. There would be no right of extradition, no right to demand your slaves; no right to appeal to the courts of justice to indemnify you for the loss of your slaves. Where one slave escapes now by running away from his master, hundreds and thousands would escape it the Union were dissevered; I care not how or where you run the line, or whether independent sovereignties be established. Well, sir, finally, will you, in case of a dissolution of the Union, be safer with your slaves within the separated portions of the States than you are now? Mr. President, that they will escape much more frequently from the border States no one will deny.

And, sir, I must take occasion here to say that, in my opinion, there is no right on the part of any one of the States to secede from the Union. War and dissolution of the Union are identical and inevitable, in my opinion. There can be a dissolution of the Union only by consent or by war. Consent no one can anticipate, from any existing state of things, is likely to be given, and war is the only alternative by which a dissolution could be accomplished. If consent was given, if it were possible that we were to be separated by one great line, in less than sixty days after such consent was given war would break out between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding portions of the Union, between the two independent parts into which it would be erected in virtue of the act of separation. In less than sixty days, I believe, our slaves from Kentucky, flocking over in numbers to the other side of the river, would be pursued by their owners. Our hot and ardent spirits would be restrained by no sense of the right which appertains to the independence of the other side of the river, should that be the line of separation. They would pursue their slaves into the adjacent free States; they would be repelled, and the consequence would be that, in less than sixty days war would be blazing in every part of this now happy and peaceful land.

[illegible] going to separate the States of this Confederacy? In my humble opinion, Mr. President, we should begin with at least three separate Confederacies. There would be a Confederacy of the North, a Confederacy of the Southern Atlantic slaveholding States, and a Confederacy of the valley of the Mississippi. My life upon it, that the vast population which has already concentrated and will concentrate on the head-waters and the tributaries of the Mississippi will never give their consent that the mouth of that river shall be held subject to the power of any foreign State or community whatever. Such, I believe, would be the consequences of a dissolution of the Union, immediately ensuing; but other Confederacies would spring up from time to time, as dissatisfaction and discontent were disseminated throughout the country—the Confederacy of the lakes, perhaps the Confederacy of New England, or of the Middle States. Ah, sir, the veil which covers these sad and disastrous events that lie beyond it, is too thick to be penetrated or lifted by any mortal eye or hand.

Mr. President, I am directly opposed to any purpose of cecession or separation. I am for staying within the Union, and defying any portion of this confederacy to expel me or drive me out of the Union. I am for staying within the Union and fighting for my rights, if necessary, with sword, within the bounds and under the safeguard of the Union. I am for vindicating those rights, not by being driven out of the Union harshly and unceremoniously by any portion of this confederacy. Here I am within it, and here I mean to stand and die, as far as any individual wishes or purposes can go—within it to protect my property and defend myself, defying all the power on earth to expel me or drive me from the situation in which I am placed. And would there not be more safety in fighting within the Union than out of it? Suppose your rights to be violated, suppose wrong to be done you, aggressions to be perpetrated upon you, can you not better vindicate them—if you have occasion to resort to the last necessity, the sword, for a restoration of those rights—within, and with the sympathies of a large portion of the population of the Union, than by being without the Union, when a large portion of the population have sympathies adverse to your own? You can vindicate your rights within the Union better than if expelled from the Union, and driven from it without ceremony and without authority.

Sir, I have said that I thought there was no right on the part of one or more States to secede from the Union. I think so. The Constitution of the United States was made not merely for the generation that then existed, but for posterity—unlimited, undefined, endless, perpetual posterity. And every State that has since come into the Union, came into it binding itself, by indissoluble bands, to remain within the Union itself, and to remain within it by its posterity for ever. Like another of the sacred connexions, in private life, it is a marriage which no human authority can dissolve or divorce the parties from. And if I may be allowed to refer to some examples in private life, let me say to the North and the South, what husband and wife say to each other. We have mutual faults; neither of us is perfect; nothing in the form of humanity is perfect; let us then, be kind to each other—forbearing, forgiving each other's faults—and above all, let us live in happiness and peace together.

Mr. President, I have said, what I solemnly believe, that dissolution of the Union and war are identical and inevitable; that they are convertible terms; and such a war as it would be, following a dissolution of the Union! Sir, we may search the pages of history, and none so ferocious, so bloody, so implacable, so exterminating—not even the wars of Greece, including, those of the Commoners of England and the revolution of France—none, none of them all would rage with such violence, or be characterized with such bloodshed and enormities as would the war which must succeed, if the event ever happens, the dissolution of the Union. And what would be its termination? Standing armies, and navies, to an extent stretching the revenues of each portion of the dissevered members, would take place. An exterminating war would follow—not, sir, a war of two or three years duration, but a war of interminable duration—and exterminating wars would ensue, until, after the struggles and exhaustion of both parties, some Phillip or Alexander, some Cæsar or Napoleon, would arise and cut the Gordian knot, and solve the problem of the capacity of man for self-government, and crush the liberties of both the severed portions of the common empire. Can you doubt it?

Look at all history—consult her pages, ancient or modern—look at human nature; look at the contest in which you would be engaged in the supposition of war following upon the dissolution of the Union, such as I have suggested; and I ask you if it is possible for you to doubt that the final disposition of the whole would be some despot treading down the liberties of the people—the final result would be the extinction of this last and glorious light which is leading all mankind, who are gazing upon it, in the hope and anxious expectation that the liberty which prevails here will sooner or later be diffused throughout the whole civilized world. Sir, can you lightly contemplate these consequences? Can you yield yourself to the tyranny of passion, amid dangers which I have depicted in colors far too tame of what the result would be if that direful event to which I have referred should ever occur? Sir, I implore gentlemen, I adjure them, whether from the South or the North, by all that they hold dear in this world—by all their love of liberty—by all their veneration for their ancestors—by all their regard for posterity—by all their gratitude to Him who has bestowed on them such unnumbered and countless blessings—by all the duties which they owe to mankind—and by all the duties which they owe to themselves, to pause, solemly to pause at the edge of the precipice, before the fearful and dangerous leap is taken into the yawning abyss below, from which none who ever take it shall return in safety.

Finally, Mr. President, and in conclusion, I implore, as the best blessing which Heaven can bestow upon me, upon earth, that if the direful event of the dissolution of this Union is to happen, I shall not survive to behold the sad and heart-rending spectacle.

TREMENDOUS DEMONSTRATION
AT
CASTLE GARDEN
THE VOICE OF NEW YORK
ON
THE UNION.
THE UNION MUST AND SHALL BE PRESERVED.

ENTHUSIASTIC PROCEEDINGS

Speeches of General Scott and Others
&c., &c., &c.

In pursuance of a call, signed by several thousand of our most respectable and influential inhabitants inviting the "citizens of the city and county of New York, irrespective of party distinction, who are in favor of sustaining the Union, by the permanent settlement of the great question now agitating the nation, upon the basis of the compromise resolutions introduced into the Senate of the United States by the Hon. Henry Clay," to assemble last evening in Castle Garden, that spacious edifice was filled to overflowing; and, were it five times as capacious as it is, it would not have afforded standing room for the thousands of persons of all parties, who desired to participate in the proceedings, and to raise their voice, or to give their vote, in favor of a compromise of the Slavery question. We have witnessed a great many public meetings in this metropolis, composed of Whigs, of Democrats, of Natives, and of citizens irrespective of party, but we never saw a more numerous, a more enthusiastic, and, we may add, a more patriotic assemblage, during the whole of our experience, than was that of last evening. There was but one opinion, one sentiment, entertained by the vast multitude; and that opinion and that sentiment was, that, come weal or come wo, the union of this great and glorious and powerful confederacy must and shall be preserved, the efforts of disunionists and factionists, of every color, shade, sect and party, to the contrary notwithstanding. It seemed, indeed, as if all the patriotic feeling of the metropolis of the western world was concentrated and found utterance in Castle Garden last evening—so enthusiastic, so unanimous, so determined was the spirit manifested, that the confedracy of States, the heritage bequeathed by our revolutionary fathers, shall be sustained in all its integrity, and handed down to posterity as whole, as perfect, as symmetrical, and as beautiful, in all its proportions as when received from those immortal men who founded it, and who cemented it with their life's blood. Throughout the day, according to the request of the Committee of Arrangements, the national flag—the glorious stars and stripes, before which, ere this, the cross of St. George has fallen—which commands respect wherever civilization has gone—which has been borne victoriously over the valleys, and planted on the mountain tops of the American continent—which is the emblem of human freedom wherever it waves—that glorious flag, throughout the day, was displayed from a thousand ships, from the Franklin House, from the American Hotel, from Florence's, from the whig and democratic head-quarters, and from various other public buildings, as an invitation for all Americans to rally around it, and save it from the assaults of those who, for self-aggrandisement, would trample it in the dust, by dissolving the confederacy it represents—the noblest and the holiest the world ever saw.

Various estimates were formed as to the number of persons who were present at this great meeting, but, taking it at a moderate calculation, we should say that ten thousand were inside the building, and many more outside. The room was decorated in a very tasteful and appropriate manner. The stage was reserved for the use of the officers of the meeting, and the press; and from the proscenium hung a gigantic American flag. Immediately in front of the step there was another national flag, and the speakers' stand was covered likewise with the stars and stripes. Dingle's Washington Brass Band amused the audience, from the time when the doors were thrown open until the commencement of the proceedings of the evening. No sooner was "Hail Columbia" performed, than shouts of applause were given, that fairly shook the roof of the garden. Then there were calls for "Yankee Doodle," and "Hail Columbia" again, all of which were received with tremendous applause. In this way the time was occupied until the proceedings commenced. At length, that is, at half-past seven o'clock the meeting was called to order by

General Sanford, who said it was with no ordinary feeling he rose to propose its organization. This was the first time, in eighteen years, that he had participated in a public movement, and it is only a subject of national importance that would induce him on this occasion, as he has done, to take part in the deliberations of a public meeting. He then proposed the following named gentlemen as officers of the meeting:

CHAIRMAN.
MAYOR WOODHULL.

VICE CHAIRMEN.

Cornelius W. Lawrence,	Robert Smith,
George Griswold,	Thompson Price,
Gerard Hallock,	Robert Hyshop,
James Gallatin,	Zophar Mills,
Moses Taylor,	Gen. Chas. W. Sandford,
Herbert Lawrence,	Nicholas Dean,
Peter Cooper,	J. A. Westervelt,
Pelatiah Perrit,	W. A. F. Pentz,
Francis R. Tillock,	Jonathan Thompson,
Ferdinand Suydam,	Charles Morgan,
Timothy Daly,	Stehhen Whitney,
Ambrose C, Kingsland,	T. F. Secor,
Jas. R. Manly, M. D.	Robt. Milliken, & oth's.

SECRETARIES.

Geo. W. McLean,	H. M. Forrester,
Richard S. Roberts,	Wm. Tyson,
S. S. Broad,	Geo. Collins, and oth's.

Mr. Nicholas Dean then proposed, for the adoption of the meeting, a series of resolutions. In proposing them, he said he disclaimed all party feelings, and he hoped that all present were animated with

the same sentiment. If ever the question which now agitates the country, be settled, it must be on the basis of the resolutions of compromise offered by Mr. Clay. On those resolutions a compromise must be made. Mr. Clay's resolutions may be amended, or amplified, or emasculated, but on their basis the superstructure of settlement, the compromise of the great question now agitating the whole Union, must and will depend, and the spirit which pervades them will prevail inevitably. With these feelings, then, said he, I take the liberty of offering the resolutions, and let me remark, for one moment, that on our action, I have no hesitation in saying, depends the future peace and permanence, in a great degree, of the whole country. (Great applause, which lasted for some minutes.) Those who have lived under our beneficent institutions, have the strongest motives possible for perpetuating them. In God's name, then, if there be a single individual in this vast room, who is not animated by the feelings which I now express, I trust he will leave this place, and make room for those who are disposed to maintain the Union, the whole Union, and nothing but the Union. (Tremendous applause, and a buzz of approbation that continued for some time.)

Mr. Ogden then read the resolutions, which were received with the greatest enthusiasm.

Before the question was taken on them, there was some commotion on the platform near the proscenium, which was succeded by a tremendous shout of applause. On looking in that direction to observe the cause of the commotion, we observed the manly figure of General Scott, the hero of Lundy's Lane and of Mexico—of him who contributed so much to the acquisition of the very territory which has caused so much discussion and agitation throughout the whole country. The gallant old General was taken by the hand and led to the front of the platform. It is needless to say that he was received most enthusiastically, and that the applause with which he was greeted did not subside for some time. As soon as he took a seat by the side of the Chairman, his Honor the Mayor, another round of applause was given in compliment to him. The band struck up the "Bould Soger Boy," and played it in excellent style. As soon as the music stopped, General Scott rose from his seat and acknowledged the complimentary manner in which he was received by the assembled thousands.

Mayor Woodhull then submitted the resolutions —All in favor, said he, of the passage, of these resolutions, will please to say "Ay!"

Such an "Ay," such a loud, tremendous and enthusiastic "Ay," as was responded, was never before heard in this, or any other city in the United States, or, we believe, elsewhere. Not a single "Nay" was uttered. All was unanimity and enthusiasm, and we could not but help believing that the many thousands present experienced a feeling of relief, as if a burden or weight had been removed from them, when, on taking the nays, not a single one was uttered—there was not a dissentient voice. The resolutions are as follows :—

Resolved, That the people of New York, without distinction of sect or party, are ardently devoted to the Union of these States, as, next to our liberties, the most precious of their political institutions; and having never yet begun to calculate the value of this Union, can contemplate no contingency in which its dissolution would be otherwise than a gigantic crime against the peace, prosperity and freedom of our country and of mankind.

Resolved, That in the resolutions lately submitted to the Senate of the United States by Mr. Clay, looking to a complete and final settlement of all questions relating to Slavery, on which the feelings of the Northern and Southern sections of our country have been excited against each other, we joyfully recognize the basis of a harmonious and brotherly adjustment of a most distressing controversy; and entreat our fellow-citizens, of all parties and sections, to study these resolutions carefully, and in a spirit of devotion to the Union and perpetuity of this noble confederacy.

Resolved, That, in view of the above considerations, we accept as the basis of a compromise the preamble and resolutions as introduced by Mr. Clay into the Senate of the United States, January 19th, 1850, viz :—

PREAMBLE.

It being desirable for the peace, concord, and harmony of the Union of these States, to settle and adjust amicably all questions of controversy between them, arising out of the institutions of Slavery, upon a fair equality and just basis: Therefore,

Resolved, That California, with suitable boundaries, ought, upon her application, to be admitted as one of the States of this Union, without the imposition by Congress of any restriction to the exclusion or introduction of Slavery within those boundaries.

Resolved, That as Slavery does not exist by law, and is not likely to be introduced into any of the territory acquired by the United States from the Republic of Mexico, it is inexpedient for Congress to provide by law, either for its introduction into, or its exclusion from, any part of the said territory; and that appropriate territorial governments ought to be established, by Congress, in all of the said territory not assigned as the boundaries of the proposed State of California, without the addition of any restriction or condition of the subject of Slavery.

Resolved, That the western boundary of the State of Texas ought to be fixed on the Rio del Norte, commencing one marine league from its mouth, and running up that river to the Southern line of New Mexico, thence with that line eastwardly, and continuing in the same direction, to the line as established between the United States and Spain, excluding any portion of New Mexico, whether lying on the east or west of that river.

Resolved, That it be proposed to the State of Texas, that the United States will provide for the payment of all that portion of all the legitimate and bona fide public debts of that State, contracted prior to its annexation to the United States, and for which the duties on foreign imports were pledged by the said State to its creditors, not exceeding the sum of —— dollars, in consideration of the duties, as pledged, having been no longer applicable to that object after the said annexation, but having thenceforward become payable to the United States, and upon the condition also that the said State shall, by some solemn and authentic act of her Legislature, or of a convention, relinquish to the United States any claim which it has to any part of New Mexico

Resolved, That it is inexpedient to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia, while that institution continues to exist in the State of Maryland, without the consent of that State, without the consent of the people of the District, and without just compensation to the owners of slaves within the District.

Resolved, That it is expedient to prohibit within the District, trade in slaves brought into it from States or places beyond the limits of the District, either to be sold therein, as merchandise, or to be transported to other markets without the District of Columbia.

Resolved, That more effectual provision ought to be made by law, according to the requirements of the constitution, for the restitution and delivery of persons bound to service or labor, in any State, who may escape into any other State or territory of this Union.

Resolved, That Congress has no power to prohibit or obstruct the trade in slaves between the slaveholding States, and that the admission or exclusion of slaves brought from one into another of them, depends, exclusively, upon their own particular law.

Mr. James Depeyster Ogden, one of our oldest and most respectable merchants, addressed the meeting. This, fellow-citizens, said he, is a meeting irrespective of all party considerations, and when we consider the object for which it has been called, that of settling the agitated question of Slavery, on the basis of the compromise submitted by Mr. Clay to the Senate of the United States, it should be above all considerations of a party character. Fellow-citizens, the treaty of peace with Mexico secured to us vast accessions of territory. In the regulations of that territory, whether by the admission of new States or the organization of territorial governments, the question of Slavery comes up with all its force, and gives to the subject an interest that no other mater could give it. We also will have the question before us when the census of the United States is taken, which will give an increase of representation in the Lower House. Fellow-citizens, you are aware that political supremacy in this country, may be at the bottom of this subject; for we know that political considerations mix with every question that comes before us. You also know that we have a party in this country called the Abolitionists; and I would ask any man to tell me, is there any step, is there any measure, is there any act, is there any proposition, emanating from them, that will lead to any practical result? I speak not of their motives—they may be good—but I speak in reference to the interests of the country. Gentlemen, when our political sky is darkened, we hail with joy the star that guides us in the storm. (Cheers.) Such a planet has appeared in the person of the Senator of Kentucky. (Cheers.) In his resolutions, he proposes to extend the olive to the South, and he asks us of the North to meet him half way. Gentlemen, what are his resolutions? He says, no power on earth could make me vote to plant Slavery where it does not exist. On that sound platform, the people of this city and State, and almost of the whole East and West, stand. (Cheers.) He proposes, that the settlement of the question of Slavery in the District of Columbia should be left to the people of the States that ceded that territory. He asks that laws may be passed to enforce those principles of the constitution which empower the owners of fugitive slaves to seize them in the free States. Fellow-citizens, whenever we act on this question, we ought to take care that we are right ourselves.—Slavery has been stigmatized as a crime, as a national disgrace. If Slavery be a crime, whose crime is it? It is not ours. It is considered that a crisis in the affairs of this country has been reached, and that the union of this country is in danger. I will not attempt to depict what might be the consequences of disunion. The human mind cannot contemplate the dark future that lies beyond. But, if this Union is to be dissolved, greater efforts must be made, and mightier minds at work, than those which now attempt to control the action of the country; the fathers of the revolution would hover around us; their ancient fire would live in their very ashes.—(Cheers.) It would not be a contest between the North and the South, or the East and the West; but the mighty masses of freemen would stride for their liberties. (Cheers.) New York is situated in the centre of the Atlantic cities. She is the centre of the commerce of the country, and, under the auspices of Heaven, she will be the last to leave the Union, (tremendous applause), she may well be called the key-stone of this mighty arch, which time cannot destroy. (Great commotion in the body of the room.) Fellow citizens, you are too full of the subject on which you have been called upon to deliberate, to listen to me—you are too full of patriotism, to make it necessary for me to remind you of the importance of the subject. (Mr. Ogden then sat down, amid loud cheers.)

James R. Whiting, Esq., was the next speaker, but the confusion was so great, it was some time before he was heard. Order being partially restored, he spoke as follows :—Fellow citizens, if you will endeavor to be quiet, I will endeavor to make myself heard. We are called together this evening, not as a party, not as Democrats, not as Whigs, not as Abolitionists, not as fanatics; but as unionists. (Tremendous cheers.) We have met together on one platform, on which all the various parties of the country, except the Abolitionists, can meet and join the right hand of fellowship, giving and receiving, and responding from our hearts that we are one and all for the Union, (great applause) and we die under this union. A great black cloud now overbangs the Southern hemisphere, betokening in its threatening aspect wide-spread ruin, carrying to distant shores the lamentable news, that in this country of liberty, equality, and union, that several States have fallen from our emblazoned argent—and for what? For some acts of injustice we have done to the South." I stand here to speak the words of truth and soberness. The North has heretofore, on many occasions, violated its duty towards the South. (a voice. "Good.") and it is high time that she meted out to the South that justice which she is entitled to by the compromises of the constitution under which we live, (great applause)—even-handed and simple justice; and when we have done that, all cause of grief and angry annoyance will be removed. Then the South must sit down under her vine and fig tree, and worship, for all time to come, under our glorious institutions. (Cheers.) The instance in which we have done this injustice is in violating that part of the constitution which requires us to yield to them their property, when it is within our control and jurisdiction—I mean by not returning to them their fugitive slaves. Fanaticism and abolitionism are but other names for burglary, felony, fraud and villany. Why, some of our States have refused to pass laws to carry out those compromises of the constitution. This was one of the compromises that brought us together, in the adoption of the constitution, in its birth and origin. It is part of its birth and creation, and we stand pledged, by our sacred honor and oaths, that whenever any slave escapes from service, and his master claims and proves property in him, we should yield him up. The question is have we done so? (Voices, "No, no.") We have not; and until we practice justice, we cannot ask the South to be either just or generous. (Applause.) We have known in this city a man to claim his property under these circumstances, and when he undertook to prove the laws of Maryland, the proof was rejected by the court, on the single ground that he could not swear he ever saw the book which he produced used in a court of justice in Maryland. Now, I will go as far as any one to redeem man from bondage, but I will not go so far as to violate the constitution, which we are bound to adhere to and which has made us what we are. Now, it is our duty emphatically, to expect to mete out justice, to recommend the passage of laws enabling the owners of fugitive slaves to reclaim their property. I have been employed in numerous cases of this kind, and from the experience I have had with gentlemen of Maryland, North Carolina and Georgia, I have never found one that was unreasonable or was unwilling to part with his slaves on terms which no honest man could object to. I defended one man called Shedro, and I never saw a finer looking fellow than he was, walking Broadway. I defended that man on the ground that his own father claimed him as a slave. The case was tried before a jury of New York, and on the proof coming out that the fugitive was begotten by him from his own female slave, the jury gave their verdict in favor of the fugitive. And North Carolina said nothing against it. Neither will Georgia, nor any other slave State, if you give them even-handed justice. I had another and a more recent case; and I tell you that the Abolitionists and fanatics are the worst men that you ever saw or had anything to do with. (Great applause.) Mr. Lee of Maryland, came to the State of New York, and he was as high-minded chivalric a gentleman as ever stood. When he came here, he found one of his slaves—a body servant of his—a man whom he allowed to go anywhere he pleased, between whom and his master the most perfect confidence existed, who was treated well, and far better than many here in the North, who claimed to be free. This man was once taken and persuaded to run away. He did not wish to run away. However, he came to New York, and was found here. When he was discovered, he was willing to go home; but he was taken by the Abolitionists, and prevented from doing so. I made arrangements to sell the negro for less than one third of his value, and, with the assistance of some man in New York, made arrangements to purchase him and some others. If these Abolitionists had let us alone, we could have arranged with Mr. Lee; but some abolition Quaker gentlemen, whose names it is not necessary to mention, and those fanatical vagabonds—those fanatical scoundrels—those petty larceny villains—those grand larceny felons, who deal in wholesale canting hypocrisy that ought to doubly damn them, interfered with the arrangement, and induced the judge to do the owner great wrong, by violating the direct principles of justice and law. In this way, they robbed the man of his property. These are the cases that make the South feel that free labor is better than slave, and that the institution itself is worse. They feel that we have repeatedly failed to do them justice, and hence I say, until we do them justice, we have no cause to say that we have done them no injustice. Let us act up to the constitution. I go for the whole constitution, and if it is necessary that we should free the slaves, let us buy them, (great applause.) Their interests and their hopes of protection, their glories in the future, depend as much upon the intactness of that constitution, as ours. Nay, more so, they cannot afford to dissolve the Union. I say, therefore, fellow-citizens, that it is our duty—that it is the duty of the North, to put down fanaticism—to exercise justice—to open our eyes and take our bandages off, and let justice hold the scales. Then, one great cause of dissatisfaction will be removed, and we will have done towards the South, what, under all the circumstances, we would wish the South to have done towards us. Let us perform our duty, and when that is done we shall hear no more of the dissolution of the Union. But, my friends, the Union cannot, must not, shall not, and will not be dissolved, as long as there are hearts and hands in the North and West to sustain and support it. A few of those present here this evening were cradled in the revolution. Many have been born, nurtured, and raised by and under the Union. Heretofore we have stood by the stars and stripes. We have seen many of those added to our national galaxy within our own experience, and stripe after stripe added to our flag. We stand forth as beacons to the world; an example to all posterity for their admiration, and an anxious world is looking to us. All the hopes of humanity are resting upon us; and shall it be said that because of some little family dissensions these stars shall be obliterated forever? ("No, no," and great applause,) and that stripe after stripe shall be torn into fragments, (cries of "Never") Let us, then, say to the South, we will do you justice, and when we do that, we will tell them that the Union shall not be destroyed: that it shall be preserved inviolate; that we will compel you to remain bundled up in this glorious union, by which we have lived, and for which we hope our successors will live. We have flourished under it, and we can then tell them that we will pledge our lives and sacred honors, that not one star shall be taken from our galaxy of glory, or one stripe removed from that glorious flag, which has waved so successfully over us. (Mr. Whiting then sat down amid loud applause.)

Joseph L. White, Esq., was then introduced by the Chairman to the meeting. He said: Mr. President—(Here there was a tremendous outcry of three cheers for General Scott, which were given enthusiastically.) Mr. White then proceeded :—Mr. President and Fellow Citizens :—It has been my fortune, on several occasions, to address a New York audience on the different topics of the day; and I am free to confess that, in the modesty of my nature it may be, that this is the first occasion on which I ever felt embarrassment, not for what I should say, but rather for what I should not say. This is a meeting of all parties, it is a union of all feelings and sentiments. We have met here this night to present to the Union and to the world the glorious spectacle of a people forgetting party and party prejudices, and unitedly looking up to Heaven to catch some inspiration by which they may be controlled in their conduct for the preservation of this great confederacy. I come here as an humble individual—one of the humblest among you—not as belonging to any other party or set of men—bearing in my hands a single plank on which I once stood, the sole remnant of the Buffalo platform—bearing this single plank before you, fellow-citizens, this evening as an element to add to the great arch for the preservation and safety of our Union, to be built up by you this night; an arch surmounted with a single pavillion, having emblazoned upon it, the single words, "The Union of the States, and nothing but Union." (Tremendous shouts of applause.) Gentlemen, it is a new, as it is a singular, necessity which calls upon the citizens of the North to come together to testify their devotion to this Union. It may be said of the North, that she has never stooped from her high estate to calculate the value of this Union; we think it invaluable, and it is not for us to calculate the value of that which is above all price and above all value. Gentlemen, it is fitting on this occasion that we should remember not only our devotion to this Union, but our ancestry, from whom we sprung.—(Cheers.) I, for one, cannot forget that while we are bound to pay due respect to the ardent, impulsive and fiery action of our Southern brethren, we, who are proverbially cooler and more deliberate in our conduct, should act without forgetting our illustrious ancestry, and should imitate their example, viz: to think twice before we are disposed to act once. I do not think our brethren of the South to whom to give the right hand of fellowship and compromise we are met together this evening, will forget their true interests; but if the North was made up of the same fiery substance, it would lead to collision and bloodshed. I do not forget, therefore, that we are made up of different, cooler and more phlegmatic materials. While they spring from the Cavaliers, we boast of descending from the Roundheads. Looking back upon the distant times of the reigns of Charles and of James, we see that the Roundheads of England were the brave men who fought for liberty, against the encroachments of the throne upon the rights of the people. We cannot forget that the Roundeads, with their sword, sent down to the grave the doctrines of passive obedience and Divine right—we cannot forget that it was the union of our ancestors at Charlestown, in Massachusetts, who struck the first blow out of which sprung the glorious Union under which we have so long flourished. Gentlemen, I think that those men who struck the blow which won us our liberties at the point of the bayonet—I think that, at least, their desires and wishes are entitled to some consideration from our brethren of the South. (Good, good.) Gentlemen, this is not the time nor the occasion, for the discussion of any tame argument. The question which now divides the North and the South—that is the question on which we are assembled here this evening. We, the Roundheads of the North, are met together this night, for what? For union. To extend to our brethren of the South the hand of fellowship and compromise—to preserve a principle which, in its majesty, is, above all others, the principle of union. For that purpose, we have come here; and I, for one, though I was wedded in heart and soul to the doctrines of free soil, am quite free to renounce it for the sake of union. [Loud Applause.] I come here as a simple individual, preferring the Union to all other considerations, whether it be to the diminution or to the extension of Slavery. I come to say to the South, "You threaten that if the Wilmot proviso is carried out, you will dissolve the Union. Well, then gentlemen, if you are serious, and I am bound to believe you are, I will sacrifice that declaration for the preservation of the Union, [Loud and tremendous cheering.] I will sacrifice it; for the value of the Union rises far above it. We will compromise—we will continue to compromise; for the principle of Union is far above all other principles. [A voice from the crowd, "no, no," other voices, "yes, yes."] I say yes; and let me prove it. The principle of the Union is that principle by which we hope to spread and and extend the blessings of human liberty; and I say to that man, whoever he may be, and I call him friend, as I do all my fellow-citizens, I say, when a compromise is terminated, when we have done all we can do, all that can be done by a law-loving Union, loving people, in order that we may maintain and preserve this confederacy of States intact and unbroken, a confederacy established by the blood of our common ancestry, when we have done all in the spirit of the ancient Roundheads, then will the flag of that Union, floating around us, and [turning round and pointing to General Scott, who sat behind him]—with that man to command us—[loud and deafening applause, waving of hats and handkerchiefs, and an enthusiasm indescribable]—with that man to command us. [here general Scott rose and bowed to the assembly, in response to the loud cheers with which he was greeted,—with that man to command us, we may defy the world. [Thunders of applause.] Gentlemen, is not that the resolve of this meeting? We will compromise, and we will continue to compromise, and when it ceases to be a virtue, and our offers are spurned, we will still stand by the flag of the Union, and never abandon the Union. That, I believe, is the determination of Northern men; we will live and die by the Union, and teach our children to do so. [Loud cheers.] We will stand by it in weal or wo; and that the Union may be preserved, we will not hesitate to sacrifice whatever else we hold dear. Gentlemen, I cannot conclude without expressing the joy I have felt on this occasion, in hearing the resolutions you have unanimously approved and adopted this evening. Although, on those resolutions I is proposed to adopt the compromise proposed by Henry Clay, yet, I trust signal and great as are the services which that great and noble statesman has rendered to his country, yet this night you will avoid making this meeting a matter of personal demonstration towards any one particular individual. The Union—that is the question which involves all our hopes of the past and of the future, and this question is above even that great statesman, though it is that which he has been, and now is, battling to preserve. Though that old hero, with the frost of many years upon his head, exhibits a sublime spectacle of patriotism and heroism, coming from Kentucky for the sake of his country—though no spectacle can be more sublime, yet I hope their will be no personal demonstration on this occasion, that attaches to persons. [Loud cheers.] If we will cheer, let us give three cheers for the Union. [Loud shouts and cheers.] Gentlemen, I have said we will compromise till all shall be in vain; and after that the North means still to live under the glorious flag of our Union; and if any felon hands should attempt to drag down that flag, we will still bear up that flag beyond the reach of fanaticism, and we will die for that flag. [Cheers.] Gentlemen, I stand here a whig, once a free soil man, and I now give the willing tribute of homage and admiration to two great democrats, who have stood by the side of Henry Clay, and dared to lift up their voices as champions for the Union, in the States. I mean Lewis Cass and Sam Houston, forming a noble trio. [Cries of "Add Tom Benton."] Mr. W. continued—I will cheerfully add to the name of Thomas H. Benton; making an illustrious band of four, who have ventured all for the Union. [Loud and continued cheering.]—These have gained for themselves an illustrious immortality, in their noble stand for the Union. Mr. White then withdrew, amid loud and tremendous cheering; whereupon loud shouts were raised for General Scott.

There being loud cries for General Scott from all parts of the room, the gallant hero of Lundy's Lane and Mexico, after appropriately acknowledging the compliment, spoke as follows:—Fellow-citizens, I came here this evening not expecting to do more than take my stand in a corner of the room for the purpose of listening to the proceedings of this very interesting and important meeting. I had no expectation of having the honor to be called upon this stand. I am indebted to the kindness of a friend, who discovered me below, for having the honor to appear in such a conspicuous manner before you. Little did I expect being called upon to address this great and glorious meeting, which is worthy of the Empire—worthy of the Empire of the States and worthy of the Union which you came here to support (Great applause.) I see before me the intelligence, the wealth, the patriotism of this great city, voluntarily coming here for the purpose of supporting that Union. I am an humble friend and devoted friend of that same Union. I do not call myself a citizen of the East or of the North, of the West or of the South. I have served that Union for nearly forty-two years, and feel that I am a citizen of every part and parcel of this glorious constellation of States. As a friend of the Union, and knowing that the Union is in jeopardy, and knowing that this meeting was called for the purpose of devising measures of compromise and conciliation, I came here. Many thanks for the kindness you have shown me. I am not an Abolitionist nor an advocate of Slavery. I would not have come here if I had thought these subjects would have militated with each other at this meeting. I did not come here as a Whig or as a Democrat. I have not attended a party meeting for upwards of forty years; but when the cry is that the Union is in danger, and rally is called for the support of the Union, I would be a coward and recreant to my country, if I did not respond to the call. I mean to give my little strength in support of the Union, and, God willing, I will do so. I am not a strong man; but I have a little strength left, and I trust I shall be buried under the Union. God grant that you may devise or fall upon some plan to save that Union to which we are, in heart and soul, all so much devoted.

The gallant general resumed his seat amid the most enthusiastic and prolonged applause. The meeting shortly afterwards adjourned, giving three cheers for General Scott and the Union.

—The Davis and Bissell Difficulty.—We find the following notes in the *Washington Union*, of the 28th :

Washington, Feb. 27, 1850.

Gentlemen : In order to remove any erroneous impressions which may have been made on the public mind, by the surmises of letter writers, in relation to a correspondence which has passed between Col. Davis and Col. Bissell, we take the liberty of requesting you to publish the following correspondence, which will show that the matter has been most honorably adjusted, to the gratification and entire satisfaction of their mutual friends.

JAS. SHIELDS.
S. W. INGE.

Washington, D. C. Feb. 22, 1850.

Sir : I am informed that in yesterday's debate you asserted that at the time it was claimed for the Mississippi regiment, on the field of Buena Vista, to have passed through the scattered files of the second Indiana regiment, and to have met the Mexican forces, who had routed and were pursuing that regiment, the Mississippi regiment was not within one mile and a half of that particular spot.

Not having been able to find a "report" of your remarks, and being the proper person to answer any charge which a man may make against the Mississippi regiment referred to, I take this mode of asking whether the information I received is correct.

Yours, respectfully, JEFF. DAVIS.

Hon. Mr. Bissell.

Washington. Feb. 22, 1850.

Sir : In your note of this date, you inquire whether I asserted in yesterday's debate, that, "at the time it was claimed for the Mississippi regiment, on the field of Buena Vista, to have passed through the scattered files of the 2d Indiana regiment, and to have met the Mexican forces, who had routed and were pursuing that regiment, the Mississippi regiment was not within one mile and a half of that particular spot."

The best answer I can give to your inquiry is to state what I did say, which was this : That, "*at the time* the 2d Indiana regiment *gave way*, the Mississippi regiment was not within a mile and a half of the scene of action." This substantially, was all I said in reference to the *Mississippi regiment*. I also said that the 2d Kentucky, the 2d Illinois, and a portion of the 1st Illinois regiments, were the troops that, *at that time*, met and repulsed the advancing columns of the enemy. In my remarks, I referred to what occurred at "that particular spot" at that point of time.

Having answered your inquiry, I deem it due, in justice alike to myself and the Mississippi Regiment, but am willing to award them the credit due to their gallant and distinguished services in that battle. My only object is to do justice to the characters of others, living and dead, whose conduct fell under my own observation on that occasion—a duty imposed upon me by remarks previously made in the course of the same debate.

Very respectfully, yours, &c. W. H. BISSELL.

Hon. Jeff. Davis.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

NEW YORK : THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 1850.

Compromise.

If there were a Saint Compromise, it would be his image that ought to be stamped upon the coins of our Republic. Our very existence as a Nation at all is due, we are told, to a Compromise, and one of a somewhat ignoble sort, not between God and Satan, but between Trade and Slavery. So that Satan and Mammon were represented at the formation of the compact, but not God. Since the sticking together of the Union, this patron Saint Compromise has intervened on several occasions to preserve the work of his clients.

This patching up of expedients is justified by a system of reasoning falsely termed common sense. Everything, they say, is the result of Compromises. Conventionalism is a Compromise between the individual and Society. Respectability is a Compromise between Virtue and Vice. Nay, life itself is a Compromise between Health and Disease. We are taught to believe that half a loaf is not only better than no bread at all, but better than any amount of bread.

Now this is not truly common sense at all, for that is the result of experience and practical sagacity teaching the *best* means of reaching a desired point, not a makeshift for getting halfway to it. Facts are things to which we must all make up our minds, however distasteful they may be to us. No matter what our own hurry may be, we must consent that Destiny shall not make advances *per saltum*, but with an almost inappreciable slowness. The most vehement Reformer must endure that his very existence shall depend upon that of his opposite pole, the unyielding Conservative. We must either get out of the way of facts or be run over by them, like the old philosopher who denied the existence of matter.

One of these tough facts is the presence and force of Evil, Unwisdom, Satan, or whatever we choose to call it, in human affairs. We may say what we please, there it is, and we must make the best of it. A great part of valuable human activity is wasted in the futile work of building barriers against the Inevitable. This, then, is the true problem—to find out what the Inevitable *is*. It is inevitable that when two forces join at an angle, a new direction is generated proportioned to the relative quantities of force. And this is the truth on which is based the fallacy that Compromise is the dictate of common sense. Practical wisdom, it is said, lies in the neutral ground, the balance between opposite poles. In spite of this, nevertheless, all that mankind has ever recognized as *uncommon* sense has been that which has come bluntly and face to face against whatever was established theory or usage.

The difficulty is that all *our* Compromises have been no Compromises at all, at least in this sense. They have rather realized the old meaning of the word, which implied a Conspiracy. They have not been modifications springing from a meeting of the two antagonistic principles of Good and Evil, but conspiracies by which Good has been uniformly betrayed. In the great game which began with the birth of the Constitution, Slavery has all along played with loaded dice. She has put on the mask of Destiny, and acted the part so well that our Statesmen have always taken defeat for granted beforehand.

Slavery, being an acknowledged evil, the very permission to exist was at first a concession and a surrender. This was called a Compromise. Then Slavery desired to extend itself, and treachery allowed it. This was called a Compromise. Again the monster felt the pains of hunger, and Texas was thrown to it. This was called a Compromise. [illegible] that Freedom sits, an outcast and a beggar, at the gates of her own ancestral dwelling. And this is also called a Compromise. Better strangle at once that "bird of our Country" of which our orators are so fond of talking, than let her go hatching the eggs of all manner of unclean birds.

It is hardly a year since the Northern Whig presses were vieing with each other in their zeal for the Wilmot Proviso. The universal Whig Dough of the Country, fermenting with the yeast of an expected victory, forgot for a moment that it was dough. Nothing was too bad for that sour and heavy Democratic batch which would not rise. Now that aspiring dough is flat and lifeless. Even General Taylor *was* in favor of the Wilmot Proviso, and Northern Whigs were seduced to vote for him upon that pretence. Let a man cheat his neighbor out of a few hundred dollars and he goes to the State-Prison. But to what Penitentiary of public contempt shall a Party be consigned, which obtains a President under false pretences? When the eye of the People becomes *clairvoyant*, it will behold, we fancy, certain unconscious gentlemen working in Congressional Committees, clad in symbolic suits of blue and red perpendicularly halved, such as are the uniform in some other public institutions.

The Wilmot Proviso was truly a Compromise. It allowed the South to keep all it had hitherto unjustly gained, but declared that it should steal no more. Our Statesmanship which has brought itself more and more into accordance with that of Europe was desirous of reproducing an American type of that greatest of Old-World humbugs, the Balance of Power. Accordingly we are now told that the beam must be kept exactly even between the Free and the Slave States, in other words, that when we make a great hole for our great cat to go through, we must also make a still greater for the little cat not yet littered.

All history is the record of a struggle, gradually heightening in fierceness, between reason and unreason between right and wrong. Of what good is it that we can put off the evil time a century, which is but a day in the history of the human race? Our statutes are subject to revision in that higher Congress where the laws of Nature are enacted. "Trent shall not wind him with so deep indent," exclaim our Glendowers.—"He must, he will, you see he *doth*," answers the progress of events. This very neutral ground of Compromise is that which is trampled at last by the contending forces of the good and evil principle. Our legislators might as well try to stay Niagara with a dip-net, or pass acts against the laws of gravitation, as endeavor to stunt the growth of avenging Conscience. Do they think that the Union can be stuck together with mouth-glue, when the eternal forces are rending it asunder? There is something better than Expediency, and that is Wisdom; something stronger than Compromise, and that is Justice.— J. R. L.

Rhode Island on Slavery.

The Legislature of Rhode Island have passed a series of Resolutions on the Slavery question as follows :

Resolved, That the people of this State retain with unchangeable fidelity that attachment to the principles of freedom which has distinguished their whole history; that having long since abolished Slavery within their own borders, they look with gratification and hope to the time when it shall be abolished in the States of our own confederacy, and throughout the world.

Resolved, That the General Assembly having often heretofore expressed its opinion on the subject of Slavery, have full confidence that our Senators and Representatives will use all honorable means to carry into effect the wishes of the people of this State, by aiding to abolish Slavery and the slave trade in all places within the jurisdiction of Congress, and by using their influence to prevent its extension to territories now free.

Resolved, That we welcome into the confederacy the new State which has just been formed upon the western confines of our Republic, and that in our opinion any attempt to exclude her from the Union, because she has of her own free will prohibited Slavery, will be a violation of the true spirit of the Constitution, which leaves the subject of Slavery in the State to the exclusive control of the people thereof.

Resolved, That we believe the preservation of the Union of these States to be important, not only to the happiness, honor and interest of our own country, but to the progress of the principles of Republican Governments throughout the world; and that it is the duty of every patriot and philanthropist to contribute to its preservation by all means not involving a sacrifice of honor or principle, or a violation of our National Constitution.

Resolved, That all questions which threaten the harmony of our Confederacy should be approached with a spirit of mutual forbearance, and with the consideration that the preservation of our Union is of paramount importance to all temporary or local interests.

All which are in accordance with the established pattern for State Resolutions, and of which the last should be especially satisfactory. But which is the 'temporary or local interest' referred to that must yield in value and importance to the preservation of the Union? Is it Slavery or Freedom? So convenient a reading *may* suit the Rhode Island Abolitionists; it certainly will the pro-slavery people.

Governor Briggs—Virginia.

Governor Briggs, of Massachusetts, has transmitted to the Legislature the Resolutions on Slavery with which Virginia has been pleased to slap him and his State in the mouth, and he sends therewith a message which thus closes. Considering that Deacon Briggs volunteered such efficient 'aid' to the South to help her gain so much territory from 'distracted and bleeding Mexico' nobody will dispute his right to grumble somewhat in the premises, nor question the moderation with which he exercises the privilege; though perhaps he is troubled with a lurking consciousness that the result is precisely what was to be expected. But then we should like to ask the Governor what he means to do about it? for that does not appear in the message :

Since the adoption of the Constitution, nine new slave States have been admitted into the Union, and five of them formed out of territory which has been acquired subsequent to that event. Mr. Jefferson and other leading statesmen believed and declared that there was no constitutional power in the Government to acquire foreign territory.

Texas and the territory ceded by Mexico have been added to the United States against the most earnest remonstrances of a great majority of the people of the Free States, accompanied by the declaration that, if acquired, the North would never consent to the extension of Slavery over any part of such territory. With aid received from the North to accomplish their object, the South, by Congressional Resolutions and by conquest, succeeded in gaining Texas, and a large extent of territory from distracted and bleeding Mexico.

With all these facts before the world, the slaveholding States—with language as harsh as the charge is unjust—now accuse the North of the deliberate purpose of violating their rights. With ten Senators in the Congress of the United States, representing five States carved out of newly acquired territory, they insist upon the privilege of extending the institution over other territory which is now free, and failing to do this, they threaten to secede from the Union. The opinion as to the Constitutionality and propriety of arresting the further extension of Slavery, is as nearly unanimous among the people of the Free States, as that upon any other important proposition which can be named.—They believe Slavery to be morally wrong, and that such a restriction would be no invasion of the rights of any individual or State, but that it is necessary to arrest an aggression upon the rights of the Free States which has been in progress for half a century. The position which Masssachusetts has assumed upon this subject she believes to be impregnable, and that carrying it out would do no wrong to any other State. Let her then, while she will obey the Constitution of the United States and observe all its guaranties—in her attitude of opposition to the further extension of Slavery be resolute and immovable.

Massachusetts and Virginia were co-workers together, in that revolution which made the Thirteen United Colonies free and independent States. They went hand in hand in framing and adopting the Constitution which cemented that glorious Union. The difference of opinion which now divides them upon the agitating subject of the day, is deeply to be deplored. I trust that no possible state of things will lead the people or the Government of Massachusetts to forget the respect and courtesy which is due to that or any other sister commonwealth, or to use toward them language of reproach or denunciation.

One of the resolution of her Legislature herewith communicated, declares that "no State has done so much to form the Union" as she has done. Heaven grant that the future historian may not be compelled to write that Virginia too, by her acts and influence, did more to dash that Union to atoms than other State. Mournful indeed would be the catastrophe of dissolution [illegible] would it be for the same historian to have to add that the reason why this ancient Commonwealth—the mother of Presidents—lent her aid to break up the Union with her sister States, among whom were the companions of her struggles and her triumphs in the cause of freedom was because those companions would not consent to extend the area of Slavery—an institution, the existence of which made her own Jefferson say that "he trembled for his country when he remembered that God was just."

Mr. Webster.—The Washington correspondent of *The Tribune* denies with great confidence that Mr. Webster intends to offer any compromise on the Slavery Question in the Senate. He also asserts that the rumor originated with certain small politicians—if any such distinctive appellation is allowable—who finding themselves in a strait hoped to force Mr. Webster, by exciting public expectation, into a position where his broad shoulders might be available in extracating themselves from a dilemma. To-day (Thursday) is allotted to the Massachusetts Senator to define his position, but we doubt if in such a storm he will render himself specially obnoxious to the charge of having done anything 'not fit' to be done by seizing the helm of the ship.

We hope he may remember and enforce these words to which he gave utterance a year and a half ago in the Senate :

"My opposition to the increase of Slavery in this country, or to the increase of slave representation in Congress, is general and universal. It has no reference to the lines of latitude or points of the compass. I shall oppose all such extension and all such increase, in all places, at all times, under all circumstances, even against all inducements, against all supposed limitation of great interests, against all combinations, against all compromises."

If he takes any other course than that here marked out he will effectually compromise himself whether he does the great question before the country or not.

The Slaves of Cuba.—"I learn," says a Cuban correspondent of the *Charleston* (*S. C.*) *Courier*, "from a good source, that it is known to the diplomatic circles in Washington, that the Captain General of the Island of Cuba has been directed by his government to liberate all the slaves in case of a serious attempt at invasion or an insurrection. That the Spanish Government has given out this hint in an official form, I know." If this be true, we shall advocate the annexation of Cuba, as the attempt at Annexation would thus lead to Emancipation, and Emancipation would be an effectual bar to Annexation. The elder Mr. Weller's favorite expression of 'circumvented' would, in that case, be particularly appropriate to the Southern brethren who are devoting their energies to extending the area of Freedom. For once they would have kept their word.

☞ A bill has been reported in the Legislature of Mississippi by which the sum of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars is to be placed at the disposal of the Governor, in case the legislation of Congress should be such that "the State should be thrown upon her reserved rights."

The *Evening Post* wonders whether they mean to pay in their own bonds?

The Legislature of Maryland have passed the bill allowing slaves to be imported from other States. An amendment was added prohibiting slaves being brought there for purposes of traffic, "but we fear" says a Baltimore paper, "that slave dealers will find it an easy matter to evade that clause of the bill." Suppose, for instance, that Hope Slaughter should continue to make Baltimore a port of export in his trade, would bringing a gang of his chattels there for shipment be 'traffic' within the meaning of the Statute? Emancipation is the only way to settle these questions, and they will remain open to torment the slaveholders till they resort to that remedy.

Wanted, a Mission.—A Mr. Jones advertises his plantation for sale, in a Southern religious Journal, and includes in the advertisement "fifty or sixty servants," which, he says, are constantly increasing in value and number. Mr. Jones is moved to part with this property as he has a desire to become a Missionary. Why does not the A. B. C. F. M. help him out of his 'organic sin,' and give him an agency?

Domestic Correspondence.

From our Boston Corre

liquor) that he only wished to make one short speech to the Convention, or rather prayer in its behalf, "May the hemp of Kentucky and the Abolitionists of Massachusetts speedily become acquainted!" In the evening, Messrs. Hopkins, of Northampton, Charles Francis Adams, John C. Park and Richard H. Dana, jr., made speeches which appeared to give general contentment. Mr. Adams's and Mr. Dana's were much above the usual class of political harangues. It was very observable that all the patriotic allusions to the Union and Constitution, with which some of the speeches were garnished, fell as flat as flounders and as dead as Julius Cæsar, on the ear of the Meeting; while the only things that brought down the House were assertions of the duty of standing by the Right, whatever might be the Consequence. Mr. Park, in particular, laid two or three well devised clap-traps, baited with the rotten cheese of Constitutional allegiance, but he caught no small deer, at all, at all. I see that the Republican's report parenthesises "(cheers)" after a declaration of his to the effect that if he had any Dissolution Blood in his veins he would drain it all out; but the ears of the Reporter must have been much better than mine, or those of the people about me, if any were given. It seemed to us that the distressing possibility of this patriotic depletion was received by the audience with the most heartless and cold-blooded indifference.

The impression made on my mind by this demonstration was two-fold. First, that the Whigs lost all their officers in the Free Soil Apostacy; and, secondly, that the rank and file of the Free Soilers are in advance of their leaders and ready for more decided action than any they are urged to take. I was glad to find that they have been carrying on a week's campaign in Mr. Palfrey's District, previous to the election next Monday. I hope they may meet with success enough to teach them that Agitation and not Quietism is the only way to any success, and that they must not be afraid of "exciting the other parties," if they wish to excite and increase their own.

I ought to give you the remainder of the Adventure of our Disunion Petitions, of which I related the beginning in my last, but fear I have hardly time. Suffice it to say our Memorial for a hearing was presented to the House by Mr. Tolman of Worcester, (the only member who voted against the leave to withdraw,) and gave rise to an animated debate, in which the right of being heard as a part of the right of petition was maintained by Messrs Tolman, Branning, Wilson, and others, and the irregularity and inconvenience of reviving a subject which had once been comfortably knocked on the head were urged by Messrs. *Hoar*, of Concord, Museum Kimball, of Boston, Smith of somewhere else, and others. The application was rejected by a handsome majority. You will be surprised to hear that, after this repulse, we have still life enough to design a similar attack on the Honorable Senate. It certainly seemed something strange to see Mr. Hoar, the very incarnate proof that there is *no* Union, using his influence to prevent us from demonstrating the fact. It is not strange, indeed, that he should not have anticipated with pleasure sitting on the Judiciary Committee and seeing his own case made the snapper of Wendell Phillips's whip, but I could have wished that his views of parliamentary convenience had allowed his voice and vote to have been heard on the other side of the question.

I chanced, on this occasion, to hear an impertinence on the part of one of our party which, if overheard, should certainly have consigned him to the custody of the Sergeant at Arms. This offender, being invited to take a seat in the body of the House, hesitated, as he said, from an apprehension that he might be mistaken for a Member. "For," he went on to say, "a man may, with perfect propriety, visit the State's Prison or the House of Correction, but he would not, willingly, place himself in a position which would give the impression that he was a Member of either!"—D. Y.

LETTER FROM STEPHEN S. FOSTER.

A MOB IN DEFENCE OF A MINISTER.

LEBANON SPRINGS, February 28, 1850.

DEAR GAY:—Although mobs against Anti-Slavery are out of fashion, in most parts of the country, we occasionally meet with them in the more benighted sections of this State. The most recent one we have encountered was at Canaan Four Corners, on Monday evening last. It was not of the ancient stamp, imposing in its numbers and terrific in its spirit, like those which tore out the heart of Lovejoy, drove Thompson from over shores, and dragged Garrison, haltered, through the streets of Boston; but in size it was a mere dwarf, and in spirit, it partook more of the *ass* than of the tiger. It had the meanness to annoy those whom it had not the courage to harm; and its energies were chiefly expended in incessant braying and in demolishing a few harmless benches which could not resent the indignity.

—This was not a drunken mob. Rum had no part or lot in the matter. Neither was it a mob of professional rowdies, but it was composed of *gentlemen*, men of standing in society, some of whom were members of the Church. One of the number, an ex-justice of the Peace, showed his respect for law by publicly proposing for us a coat of tar and feathers.

The object of the mob was a defence of the character of their minister which they alledged had been scandalized by some remarks of mine. I had charged him with being an abettor of Slavery, and an accomplice of the slave-master, and had assigned this as the reason of his opposition to our meetings. The aggrieved party were invited, not only by ourselves, but by the audience to try their hand at a more honorable defence, but for reasons which we were left to conjecture, this invitation was declined.

The principal puppits who danced on this occasion were two brothers by the name of Bancroft, cousins of the Historian, a Mr. Russell J. Hemmingway, and Chestar Beale, Esq. The Bancrofts, I regret to say, are from Massachusetts, natives of Westfield, and they fully proved their relationship to the man who, at the dictation of Southern women-whippers, erased from his history every manly sentiment that reflected upon their infamous institution. But the wire-puller of the whole affair was the Rev. Mr. Wicks. The mob was not only in his defence, but it was through his influence that it was got up. The mass of the citizens were strongly opposed to it. The Trustees of the house used their utmost exertions to preserve order; and when a call was made upon the friends of order to separate themselves from the Mobocrats, and be seated, not a dozen were left standing. Yet for want of legal authority on the part of the Trustees to make arrests, this small number were able to break up the meeting at an early hour, and thereby deprive their neighbors of the opportunity of listening to our views.

—After the first outburst of passion had expended itself in threats and intimations of personal violence which were soon curbed by the bold front presented by the friends of free discussion, order was restored and it was proposed that we should proceed; but whenever either of us commenced speaking the above named gentlemen would set up an idiot yell at the top of their voices, and ours were entirely drowned in the uproar. They were repeatedly entreated by their fellow-citizens either to speak themselves, as they had been invited to do, or allow us to proceed; but these entreaties were of no avail. They felt instinctively that the only successful defence of their minister against our charges which could be made, was the one they had set up, and hence they very naturally adhered to it, notwithstanding the earnest remonstrances of those with whose wishes, under other circumstances, they would have yielded a ready compliance.

I shall not now go into a detail of the evidence on which I charge the Rev. Mr. Wicks with being the instigator of this mob, as it would occupy space which may, perhaps, be filled with more profitable matter. But should he desire to see it in print, if he will signify to me his wishes through the columns of the *Standard*, I will forthwith lay it before your readers, that they may judge for themselves of the propriety of the accusation. Mr. W's conduct in this matter has been peculiarly reprehensible.

It is due to the women of Canaan Four Corners to say that they displayed great courage and self-respect on this occasion. At the commencement of the disturbance, they were politely requested by the gentlemen rioters (who then appeared much more numerous than they afterwards proved to be) to leave the house as a preliminary to the removal of the speakers, but, I believe, not a woman left her place. Several of them, on the contrary, expressed strong indignation at this attempt to dictate to them as to whom they should hear, and advised the disturbers either to behave themselves or go home and let those who desired to hear have the opportunity.

Before closing I will take the opportunity to say that our meetings, generally, in this vicinity have been highly satisfactory. At no former period in my experience has there been so general a desire to hear, and such ready acquiescence in the truths of Anti-Slavery. If the friends of Freedom fully understood how much can be done at the present time, by the living speaker, I am sure they would furnish the Executive Committee of the American Society with the means of sending out a much larger number of agents. The harvest truly is great, but the laborers are few.

S. S. FOSTER.

Letter from G. W. F. Mellen.

Mr. GAY.—I perceive the report of the proceedings of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society says, that the resolutions I offered, not being seconded, there was consequently no action upon them. I trust you will let me observe through your paper, that I read my resolutions and made some observations upon them, and handed them to the chairman of the meeting, expecting to say something more on the subject and upon the resolutions brought forward by the Business Committee, and had a right to expect that in common courtesy, my resolutions would have been offered for action either for approval or disapproval of the meeting. Those who took the management of the meeting, can tell, perhaps, better than I can, why things took the course they did. Your New York Convention, it may be, learnt them a lesson.

However, as Governor Seward has practically seconded my resolutions, by the bill he has introduced into the Senate of the United States for the fining of the Judges of the United States and District Courts, if they should in any case refuse the privilege of the Habeas Corpus to any, who may apply for it, perhaps I can afford a little rebuff by our friends, when it is so evident to by most every one that they are in the wrong on this subject.

Yours truly,

G. W. F. MELLEN.

Congressional.

THE question of Slavery is still under consideration in Congress, the Union not being yet dissolved, to the exclusion of all other business. We select such portions of the debate as will be of most interest to our readers, —first, that on the bill introduced by Mr. Doty, of Wisconsin, in the House for the admission of California, and second, Mr. Calhoun's long-expected speech in the Senate. We copy the Telegraphic reports to the city papers.

In the House on the 27th ulto., Mr. Doty introduced the following bill, entitled—

"An Act to admit the State of California in the Union."

Whereas, The people of California have formed for themselves a Constitution and State Government, and applied for admission into the Union as a State, and whereas the said Constitution has been officially communicated to Congress, and is Republican, therefore;

Sec. 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the State of California, with the boundaries described in the said Constitution, shall be one and is hereby declared to be one of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on the equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever.

Sec. 2 The said State of California shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the soil within the same by the United States, nor with any regulations Congress may make for securing the title in such soil to *bona fide* purchasers thereof. No tax shall be implied on lands which are the property of the United States; which said provisions are hereby declared to be fundamental conditions on which the said State is admitted into the Union.

Mr. GREEN gave notice that he would submit an amendment, establishing the Missouri boundary line.

Mr. TOOMBS took the floor—

He said the fact could not be disguised. Fifteen States were discontented, and it was almost impossible for a free people, or any portion of them, to be dissatisfied, unless there be some solid foundation for the complaint. As a representative of a portion of the people who are dissatisfied it was his purpose to examine the ground of complaint, and see whether the grievance was well founded. The Southern people believe that it is contemplated by the majority to deprive them of a just equality in the Government, and to put them in collision with sixteen hundred millions of their property.—They believe they have the Constitution as a guarantee. If not, they desire to know it; and they demand new safeguards for their future security, as they supposed that when they came into the confederacy they had them. We have now arrived at an interesting period in history, to test the power of a written Constitution to protect the rights of the country. When the Constitution was about to be formed, there was opposition to Slavery, which came near frustrating the attempt to form a Federal Government. Before however the slave States consented to a common Government, they demanded common securities. Our ancestors yielded to them the slave trade for a specific time, and gave them a representation on slave property, and made provision for the recapture of fugitive slaves. There was another security of good faith. Gentleman claimed the right under the Constitution to restrain and to abolish Slavery. The South as a country, understand this, Northern men claimed this by implication. Wherever our flag waved, Slavery is entitled to the same perfection. From the first Congress to 1790, up to 1320, with the exception of the law governing the Northern Territory, the uniform precedents have predicted property in slaves. This has never been denied, and he challenged the production of authority. In 1820, when the Missouri Compromise was passed, the principle of interference was asserted. He would tell gentlemen, in sincerity and truth, that the moment they bring this Government into conflict with $1,500,000,000 worth of slave property, there would be an end of it, and no Government ought to stand which would thus act. Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and other States may send men here entertaining abolition sentiments, but they must not seek to violate the principles of a Government formed alike by slaveholders and non-slaveholders, for the protection of both. It is not true that slaveholders cannot go to the Territories with their property, unless there is a law allowing it. Slavery can go wherever it is not prohibited by law. The South are content with the institutions, and wish to be let alone. It was the duty of the South to defend their rights here, and the duty of the People everywhere; when that fails, it was for the People to appeal to the violated contract. When the Constitution fails to protect them they will stand by their arms.

Mr. BAKER was glad to announce that soon the flag of the Republic would waive over the sovereign State of California, to reflect our splendor and glory forever and forever. Was there a foot of territory ever acquried, on which Slavery existed, with which the North have ever interferred? They allowed it to remain where it was.

Mr. MCLANE—Was not Slavery prohibited North of 36 deg. 30 min.?

Mr. BAKER—North-West.

Mr. MCLANE—Slavery was excluded from Iowa.

Mr. BAKER—No.

Mr. CONRAD—Slavery existed in the Province of Louisiana when it was acquired, and was excluded from a portion of it by the Missouri Compromise.

Mr. BAKER remarked that what he said was literally true, for all purposes. If there was no law excluding Slavery from Iowa and Oregon, it never could have gone there—the climate prevented it. Slavery was never there to any extent. He denied that the North had ever interfered with anybody's rights as to the rule of property. Was not the Wilmot Proviso principle applied to Oregon, and in the Missouri compromise bill, and did not the people acquiesce? Is there any difference between what it was now proposed to do, and what has been done? No man can point to any reason why, if it be constitutional to prohibit Slavery north of 36 deg. 30 min., it cannot be abolished south of that line?

Mr. CABELL.—Slavery can go where its owner pleases and it is the duty of Government to protect it.

Mr. BAKER said Congress had the same power in the District of Columbia as the Legislature of Maryland has in that State. Congress has exclusive jurisdiction in the territories, and has the power to regulate property, or nobody has. Did gentlemen mean to tell the North that if the Wilmot Proviso should pass, they will dissolve the Union? You are going to dissolve the Union —for what? Your fathers did what the Congress who passed the Oregon bill did, and the late President approved. If so, how will you do it? He would be alarmed if he thought that the Union was in danger. How do you imagine the Union is to be dissolved?

Mr. COLCOCK—as allusion has been made to him, he repeated that if the Wilmot Proviso, in any form, should pass, and Slavery be abolished in the District of Columbia, he would introduce a resolution, that the Union ought to be dissolved.

Mr. BAKER—Would he introduce a resolution that the Union shall be dissolved, or is dissolved?

Mr. COLCOCK will even take that form. The adoption of the Wilmot Proviso would expel the South from the Territories, and in effect this would be a dissolution of the Union.

Mr. BAKER—Suppose we of the North put down the resolution, or amend it, by saying the Union is not dissolved—what good would the resolution do? The South have been trying to accomplish this resuls for eighteen years.

Mr. COLCOCK never heard so absurd a proposition. It Congress pass a bill incorporating the Wilmot Proviso, or abolishing Slavery, he would introduce a resolution that the Union ought to be dissolved. The gentlemen, and all the North, would be convinced that the South are in earnest.

Mr. BAKER took this as more declaratory than preparatory; and the resolution so often passed in the minds of the gentlemen, do no great harm in the dissolving of the Union. Oh, ye gods! if it does pass, would that dissolve the Union? He wanted to know how the South were going beyond the resolution? He had heard the descriptions of swords in point of wit, duty and eloquence; but no one has said that he would draw the sword against the constitutional power of the government—how and when? It is doubtful whether the Nashville Convention will assemble, as some of the Southern States will not indorse it. He again asked, how are you going to dissolve the Union, if the Wilmot Proviso should pass to-morrow? He would go against the admission of any State into the Union whose constitution tolerates Slavery. If the South threaten the North if they do not compromise, in their own language, the North says, let them come. He held it to be demoralizing to the great American people, to those who cherish the name of Washington, under the broad shadow of the wings of the eagle, in the name of Freedom and Constitutional Liberty, to compel Slavery to go where Freedom has always existed. It would be a disgrace to the civilized world; and when he was asked to extend Slavery, to increase slave representation in Congress, the North would not fight for any such purpose. If disunion come, it will be the fault of the South, and not that of the North, and they will abide the result.

Mr. MCLANE of Maryland, after showing the position of the Whig and Democratic parties in the last Presidential contest, and that a man had been elected who had excited the opposition of the South, and is now known to be committed to a line of policy admitted by the South to be vital to their dearest interest. He is now regarded as the President of the North, and statesmen of that section are willing to subscribe to the President's recommendation; but Southern gentlemen find themselves allied side by side with Southern Democrats —there is an exrteme issue before the country. The North say that Slavery shall be excluded where it can be, and it is this Congress which is to decide whether the Whig and Democratic parties are to extricate themselves. For himself, he stood ready to extricate himself, that he might co-operate with the independent men of the North. He placed himself on the tenth article of the Constitution, that the powers not delegated to the United States, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. Gentleman might talk to him about the Missouri Compromise. If they mean that the line of 36 deg. 39 min. is to be run by Congress, saying that Slavery shall not exist North, and Slavery shall be tolerated South of it, he wanted no such compromise. Give us non-intervention, and give it to us in good faith; give us the Missouri Compromise line, free on one side and slave on the other, expressly allowed. To do otherwise, would be to admit that the Territory was governed outside of the Constitution. He did not believe that the Democratic party is dissolved, it was alive, and was going to live; but not as a sectional organization. He appealed to the Democracy to trample down those who insist upon the Wilmot Proviso. The people are influenced by these only to a limited extent. All would not have the hope he had, if he thought that politicians and statesmen, were to settle the question. The people would do this, who believed that the glory of all is the glory of the Federal Government.

Mr. VENABLE said Southerners regarded their honor dearer than any other consideration.

Mr. MCLANE did not regard the annexation of Texas as Southern, but Democratic policy. He held the Democratic party responsible for it, and admitted that out of this grew the Mexican war. No man denied the right of California to form their Constitution. Under the treaty, he recognized their right to be received into the Union, at the discretion of Congress. It was an honest and conscientious discretion, and consistent with their rights to form their Constitution. As to time, he could not present any apology that they have prohibited Slavery. So far as admission is concerned, we are bound to take the question on its merits. He would vote for the admission on its merits, and with its present boundaries. If non-intervention, according to General Taylor's policy, be insisted on, he would not vote to drive the South from that Territory, if Congress will legislate in good faith, on the principle of non-intervention. He would vote with the utmost pleasure and satisfaction, for giving the people of California the whole of the Pacific coast. If non-intervention failed, then he would vote for slave territory South, and for free North of 36 deg. 30 min., and to extend the Texas boundary west until it reaches California.

Mr. CONRAD obtained the floor, whereupon the Committee rose, and the House adjourned.

On the 4th the debate on Doty's bill was continued in the House:

Mr. DOTY said the House gave him the privilege a few days ago, to send to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, a bill containing all the objects embraced in his resolution instructing the Committee on the Territories to bring in a bill for the admission of California, with her present boundaries; therefore, he would withdraw the resolution, having no desire to press it. He commenced a few remarks about what had been said concerning the moving of the previous question, when

Mr. INGE objected to debate.

Mr. MCLEAN moved the House go into Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, to proceed with the special order.

Mr. JONES said, before the question is put, he wished to move the California subject be made the order of the day.

The SPEAKER remarked that it was already before the Committee, and would continue so, unless the special order intervened.

Mr. MCLEAN's motion prevailed.

The bill to continue in course, allowing Baltimore City to levy tunnage duties for improving the basin, was taken up, explained by Mr. McLane, and laid aside to be reported.

Several gentlemen wished to go on with the California question, but the Committee refused to rise.

The House then took up the California message.

Mr. SACKETT said, that the question of Slavery, in its different forms, had swallowed up all others and no public business can be transacted until it is disposed of. He quoted the remarks of distinguished Southern men in condemnation of the institution—in condemnation of Slavery—which, he said, was appalling to the sense of humanity The South was by no means in favor, generally, of Slavery. It was the right of man to control himself, and regard himself as a human being —as a man that has been brought before the world. The consideratson of this subject was not the result of sectional character and antipathies. He proceeded to show, that the design and object of the framers of the Constitution was to limit, circumscribe, and ultimately overthrow the institution in this country. He derived this knowledge from the fact that Congress did interdict Slavery in every portion of the Territory where they had the power so to do. He examined into the history of the Southern Territory, to show that this was done, and that it was the intention of the Government originally. It had been said that Slavery exists outside of the Constitution. Gentlemen of the present day, either do not understand that instrument, or those who made it meant that outside of a Slave State, the slave is free; else why did they make provision for his recapture? Slavery was secured only by local legislation. If California was to secure all the local rights enjoyed in the States, a catalogue had better be appended to a bill for that purpose. The Constitution provided for a representation of persons, not of property. The question has been asked: Are we not bound to protect Slavery? He replied, no. If banking is prejudicial, do you not exclude it? If Slavery is not beneficial, we are bound to exclude it also. A crisis has arrived when Slavery must be excluded from California and other parts of the country. He not only believed that Slavery would be prejudicial in California, but anywhere. What is the wide-spread discontent of which gentlemen from the South speak? Has any right been violated? No; it is because Slavery cannot violate the rights of the free. Government never yet has made Free soil Slave soil, and he trusted it never would. He did not believe that this Union was to be dissolved. He had no fears of such a result. It was not to be dissolved by a Nashville Convention; by no force under the standard of rebellion—by none under the black standard of Slavery. He believed that this administration had done much for human freedom, and so far he would support it.

Mr. MCWILLIE said that it was not his intention to make a party speech. The question of the time is higher than party, and crimination and recrimination. He believed that the Union is in the most imminent danger. He looked around and could see no point of safety. On the one hand, the Northern States, almost without exception, are arrayed against the South on the Slavery question; on the other, he saw at the South State after State assuming the attitude of defence. He knew nothing of the past; but he saw and deprecated the present shadows, clouds and darkness that rest on the people. He loved all his country, North and South, East and West. He loved it because it contained the graves of his ancestors and the home of his wife and children, and because it gave a common inheritance of liberty, glory and hope; because its Government was founded in the toil, suffering and blood of the Revolution; and because our fathers united us in bonds of political union. He believed that they acted wisely, and he trusted, hoped and prayed that neither the ambition of the few nor the madness of the many will be sufficient to sunder the States which it seems God has cemented together. The House is not yet fully organized; the Door-keeper and Postmaster are yet acting by sufferance. We not only see the agitation here in the speeches of members, but in their social relations. Men are becoming estranged one from another. Look at the Congressional Directory, and see how the messes are made up, and social ties broken. It is not in the nature of man to love those who rebuke and cast reflections on them. We have been told that Slavery is a disgrace to any nation. The public press at the North, the legislative assemblies, and the churches, and in every place where two or three meet together, there is the fell spirit of Free Soilism and Abolitionism. Not only on this floor are social relations broken, but the agitation desecrates the offices of God himself. We already have practical disunion, as far as depends on the church. There is a Methodist Church South, and a Methodist Church North; a Missionary Baptist Church North and South, and with the greatest difficulty the union of the Presbyterians was maintained. These churches embraced an immense majority of the people of the States. Like causes produce like effects. Discord produced the Northern and Southern churches.—Discord may make a Northern Government and a Southern Government. In the late Presidential election the present Chief Magistrate was voted for at the South as a pro-slavery man, and at the North as a non-slavery man. The leaders deceived the people, in order that they might act together. The people have lost the control of their own Government, and this is the reason why, at this moment, the whole Executive Department stands dumb in the presence of the power of Abolitionism. He was no alarmist, and desired not to excite the fears of any one. He appealed to the patriotism of this House, and would appeal to the House whether these facts ought not to give us warning. He believed that the time had come when every man who loved the Constitution, should stand by or die by it. The man who could to-day think of himself, or of party, would desert the flag of his country for a pecuniary consideration. The time has come when the question must be settled. We cannot delay. The Union will drop down, or be pulled down. He would appeal to his brethren of the North, and ask them to forbear. Have not the lines fallen to them in pleasant places, and given to them a goodly heritage! We have grown and flourished beyond any country. We have grown from thirteen to thirty States, and have territory for more. Our eagles dip their wings in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Our banners float on the St. Lawrence and on the Rio Grande. We can almost claim that the whole boundless Continent is ours. The people of the South know their rights; they recognize the guarantees of the Constitution, and are resolved at any and every hazard to maintain them. They will maintain their rights, even should disunion result. A state of things was growing up which made it utterly impossible to get on unless the question should be settled, or unless the South sink into absolute submission. The South, if the North do not do them justice, will separate from them. The Constitution teaches us the bounds of liberty, and points where aggression shall cease, and resistance begin. The South must defend their rights at the expense of blood, if necessary. All that the South ask is to be let alone—that the aggressions against the South shall cease. The South never violated any article of the Constitution, with regard to the North, nor has she given cause for complaint. The South have not only been just, but generous. He then argued on the Southern side as to Slavery; spoke of the madness of abolition in Congress, and argued the Constitutional question in favor of Slavery. If this institution is to be excluded from our recent acquisition, the Union not only ought, but will, be dissolved. He wanted the Missouri compromise, or some other mode adopted, that agitation may be stayed; that the question of abolition of Slavery in the District cease, and more effectual means be taken for the restoration of runaway slaves. If you do not do this, and cannot agree, in God's name let us part. If two of my children did not agree better than the States, they ought to be recaptured. The holy connection of husband and wife should be dissolved if they could not do better than we are doing.

Mr. VAN DYKE said that the North had been called pickpockets, cutthroats, robbers, oppressors, aggressors, and enemies of their Southern neighbors. However, there is not one single word of truth in the charge of aggression. Since the Government has been established, seventeen new States have been received into the Union—nine Slave and only eight Free States. More than two-thirds of the territory is slave; and the North, with two-thirds the population, only got one-third of the territory of the States. He proceeded to show that cession, by Virginia, of the Northwest Territory, had no reference to Slavery, and that the clause prohibiting it passed when all men nearly thought alike on this subject: and he insisted that the North never attempted to prohibit Slavery south of the Missouri Compromise line, and that in all our acquisition of Territory, the South have got nearly the lion's share. Gentlemen make terrible threats with impunity, because they will never put them into execution. Why is the southern Convention called? What is the rumbling to justify the terrible uproar? Gentlemen said, because an attempt was made to dishonor the South. How dishonor it? If they put themselves on the ground of irregularity against the admission of California, they must stand there. This will be no cause for dissolving the Union. In this District not only Slavery, but the Slave-Trade itself exists, in its most hideous and infamous form, and has been allowed to be carried on under the noses of all, and beneath the flag of the Union, when the North have power to destroy it. Yet it is a living, burning disgrace to this nation, and, under the eyes of Northern men and foreign Ministers, they must see negroes linked together, and driven to the ship and sent south like cattle. As to legislative aggressions, for every one he would point to ten on the part of the South. Men come from that section and kidnap, and carry away, without law, persons who are not slaves.

Further remarks, vindicating the North from aggression, were made.

Mr. HALE obtained the floor, the Committee rose, and the House adjourned.

IN THE SENATE on the 4th instant, on motion of Mr. Butler, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of Mr. Clay's Compromise Resolutions.

Mr. CALHOUN briefly stated his inability to address the Senate in person, and returned thanks for the courtesy which the Senate had extended him, in permitting him to have his views read upon the great question of present agitation. He then asked Mr. Mason to read his speech for him.

Mr. MASON proceeded to read. Mr. Calhoun commenced by asking what can be done to save the Union? It was necessary, first, to find the cause of danger, before a remedy could be applied. The danger arose, first, from the discontent in all the Southern States, which commenced with the agitation of the Slavery question, and has continued ever since. The next question was, what has caused the disquiet? It resulted from the conviction, on the part of the Southern States, that they could not live in the Union, under the existing state of things, with safety to their honor and interests. He proceeded next to show, by statistics, that the equilibrium of the different sections of the Union has been lost, in consequence of the increase of population in the North. This state of affairs places the control of the Government exclusively in the hands of the North, making them a majority of the States, and a large majority of the population, which would be largely increased by the census. In addition to this, the newly acquired territory would also add speedily at least five new States to the North, while no additional territories were progressing in the South. He next proceeded to show that the action of the General Government has been such as to give control to a sectional majority, by which the South has been deprived of its share in the Territories. The first act having such effect was the ordinance of '87, the next, the Missouri Compromise, and the last act by which the South were excluded from Oregon, the result of all which has been to exclude the South from three-fourths of the territory acquired by the Federal Government, giving her one-fourth only. The North had also unsettled the equilibrium between the two sections, by adopting a system of revenue and disbursements which has imposed unequal burdens upon the South to the advantage of the North. The action of Congress, in the next place, had resulted in a concentration of power in the Federal Government to the manifest disturbing and violation of State Rights. The result of all these series of measures and this course of policy was to give the North an ascendancy in every department of the Government. He then proceeded to consider the views and feelings of the people of the North, relative to the institution of Slavery, which the South felt to be necessary to her social organization, and which, he said, was looked upon with greater or less hostility by the whole North, all the people of which felt bound, at least to discountenance it, while they of the South felt themselves impelled to defend it. He reviewed the course of the Slavery agitation by the North, commencing with the first battle upon the Right of Petition, and coming down to the present day, for the purpose of showing that encroachments upon this point had been continual, gradual, and always successful, until imminent danger to the Union itself had now arisen. He contended that the first organized movement by Abolitionists had continually increased in numbers, importunities and demands, until their work has reached a point which has demanded immediate and earnest efforts for its arrest. What, then could be done to arrest its progress, and what could save the Union? Disunion would not be effected by a single blow—it was the work of time—for the cords which bind the Union were too numerous to be snapped all at once. One of the many cords which had bound the Union together was the Religious Cord, the sympathy between the associations of various religious denominations of both sections. The first of the cords which snapped was that of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The next, the Division of the Baptists into two opposing sectional parties. The Presbyterian Cord had not altogether given way, although some of its strings were broken—the Episcopalians only, of the four great denominations, remained firm and unbroken. [As a result of this agitation, Mr. Calhoun makes no reference whatever to the Catholics.] The next great cord which had snapped was that of Political party organization, which had held together until recently, when it had been severed by the increased agitation. Again: how could the Union be saved? It could only be by adopting such measures as will satisfy the Southern States that they can remain in the Union with safety and honor to themselves. It could not be saved by eulogizing the Union, nor by appealing to the memory of Washington; neither was there anything in the life and example of that distinguished man which could deter the South from seceding. On the contrary, there was much to encourage them to secession, as a remedy for oppression and deprivation of their rights. Mr. Clay's plan or the plan proposed by the Administration, could not save the Union. The latter was nothing but a modification of the Wilmot Proviso, and still more objectionable than that measure. Its very object was to deprive the South of its rightful participation in the Territories. Looking at the Constitutional question, he contended that the power of legislation for the Territories is vested exclusively in Congress. In this view, the action of the people of California, in forming a government for themselves, had usurped the power of Congress. Their conduct in this respect was revolutionary and rebellious in its character. He expressed his full conviction that the people of California had been influenced in their action by persons acting under the suggestions and authority of the Executive. He also proceeded with an effort to show that the action of California, and the Executive proposition for her admission into the Union, was in direct violation of all the past action of Congress. What, now, would the Senate do?—Much depended upon their action. If they admitted California into the Union they would sanction all she had done. Were Senators prepared, in admitting her, to surrender the Constitution, in view of her oaths to support it? He denied that there was any such State as California—it had no legal existence, and could not have, without the sanction of Congress. They could only form a Constitution when Congress had given them leave so to do. How could gentlemen on the Whig side of the Chamber, after defeating the candidate of the party, (General Cass) at the late election, who took the ground that Congress had no power of legislation, now turn around and admit a State upon the ground that she had exercised this very power which had been denied in the Presidential contest? How could those gentlemen who voted, on the Oregon question, against the position that Congress had the sole and absolute power of legislating for the Territories, now propose to sanction a course directly the reverse? What did all this mean? Were they to conclude that the exclusion of the South from the Territory acquired from Mexico is an object of such paramount importance that right, justice, consistency and the Constitution, must all yield thereto? There was but one way by which the Union could be saved, and that was by the full and final settlement, upon the principles of justice, of all the questions at issue between the two sections. The South asked for simple justice, less than that she ought not to take. She had no compromise to offer, but the Constitution, and could make no surrender or concession. By satisfying the South she could remain honorably and safely in the Union, and by restoring tranquility could this be done? Yes, easily—not by the weaker party, for it could not protect itself, but by the stronger. The North had only to do justice, by conceding to the South n participation in the Territories, by doing her duty in causing the arrest and delivery of fugitive slaves, by ceasing the agitation of the Slavery question, and by providing an amendment of the Constitution, such as would restore to the South the power to protect herself, which she possessed before the equilibrium between the sections was destroyed by the action of the Government. Would the North agree to this? Yes, if her love for the Union was half as great as her professions. At all events, the responsibility of saving the Union rested on the North and not upon the South. The South could not save it by any act of hers, and the North might save it without sacrifice. If this question was not now settled, there was no telling when it would be. If you said Mr. Calhoun, cannot agree to settle these questions on the principle of justice and duty, say so, and let the States we represent agree to separate and part in peace. If you are unwilling we should part in peace, then tell us so, and we shall know what to do when you reduce the question to submission or resistence. If you remain silent, you will compel us to infer what you intend. In that case, California will become the test question. If you admit her, under all the difficulties that oppose her admission, you compel us to infer that you intend to exclude us from the whole of the acquired Territories, with the intention of destroying irretrievably the equilibrium between the two sections. We would be mad not to perceive, in that case, that your real objects are, power and aggrandisement, but we would be infatuated not to act accordingly In conclusion, he repeated, that he had all along endeavored to repel these aggressions of the North, by arresting the agitation, with the intention of saving the Union if possible, and if not, to save the section where his lot had been cast. Having done his duty, let what would come, he would be free from all responsibility.

Mr. WEBSTER expressed his desire to address the Senate on Wednesday or Thursday next, and, after some conversation, it was understood that Mr. Hamlin speaks to-morrow, Mr. Walker on Wednesday, and Mr. Webster on Thursday.

Mr. HALE gave notice of his intention to reply to what he considered the Romance of History of the Anti-Slavery agitation presented by Mr. Calhoun.

The Senate then adjourned.

General Intelligence.

THE Water Cure establishment of the late David Ruggles at Northampton, Mass., is offered for sale.

—JOHN P HALE—The *Elyria* (O.) *Courier* places the name of Senator Hale at the head of its columns as a candidate for the Presidency.

—FATHER MATHEW arrived in Columbus (Geo.) on the 15th instant, and was received with marked attention. He soon administered the pledge to a large number.

—THE *Cincinnati Advertiser* states that the whole number of hogs slaughtered in the valley of the West, during the past year, was 1,097,957.

—MR. JAMES, the distinguished novelist, says *The Literary World*, will, we understand from the best authority, visit the United States early the ensuing season, with his family.

—A BILL has been introduced in Congress by Mr. Schenck, to reduce the nominal value of Spanish coin circulating in the United States. It proposes to rate the quarter dollar at twenty cents; the eighth or twelve and a half cent piece, at ten cents; and the sixteenth, or six and a quarter cent piece, at five cents.

—CHILD-MURDER.—The infant child of Mr. Mortimer, residing in Washington, was put to death, last week, by a slave girl, aged 16. Mrs. Mortimer whipped the girl for some offense. Leaving the room, shortly after, where the child was asleep in its cradle, she heard it make a noise as if strangling, and running in perceived a strong smell of laudanum. The child died soon after, and the belief is that the girl poured a quantity of the laudanum down its throat, from a phial of the drug which was in a cupboard.

She has been committed for trial on a charge of murder.

—ON DIT.—A correspondent of the *Lowell Courier* mentions a rumor that Charles Francis Adams has returned from Washington, impressed with the conviction that it is the duty of the North to rally unitedly in support of General Taylor's administration, as the best means of advancing the Anti-Slavery cause.

—CREDAT JUDÆUS.—It is reported that Barnum is exhibiting at his Museum, in Baltimore, a member of one of the *second* families in Virginia. The genuineness of the phenomenon's pretensions is inferred from his habits, he neither smokes nor chews tobacco, nor swears, nor drinks, nor breeds slaves; he never held an office, but has always earned his living, and is not at all ardent.

We shall not believe that there are any Virginians who do not belong to the *first* families, till we see the fact stated in a *first edition* of the *Evening Express*.—*Evening Post*.

—WE learn from private letters, says the *Evening Mirror*, that our worthy citizen, James Phalen, Esq., is giving splendid entertainments in Paris, which are honored and graced by all the beauty and nobility of that gay capital. Mr. Phalen lately gave a dinner to Lord Brougham, which is described as a very unpretending and quiet, yet altogether elegant affair. Another family from UNION SQUARE are on velvet at the Tuileries, and frequently entertained by LOUIS NAPOLEON, and other members of the "Royal Family."

—'NO COMPROMISE.'—A few months ago a slave living about eight miles from Washington, who was owned by a good, pious member of the church—a "mother in Israel"—ran away, leaving a wife who is now in Slavery Wishing to be with his wife, he offered to compromise with his *pious* mistress, but she rejected his offer after the following spirited manner:

"February 2d—When my man Gabriel Campbell pays me the sum of Three Hundred Dollars in cash and the sum of Fifty Dollars jail fees, that I paid for him when in the District jail, then I will give him his *free* papers.

"LETETIA LANHAM."

—AT a recent meeting of the Boston Society of Natural History, says a Boston paper, Dr. Warren, of this city, stated a simple, easy, and effectual cure of stammering, which is known to be generally a mental and not a physical defect. It is, simply, at every syllable pronounced, to tap at the same time with the finger; by so doing, the most inveterate stammerer will be surprised to find that he can pronounce quite fluently, and by long and constant practice he will pronounce perfectly well. Dr. Warren said that this may be explained in two ways—either by a sympathetic and consentaneous action of the nerves of voluntary motion in the finger and in those of the tongue, which is the most probable; we know, as Dr. Gould remarked, that a stammerer, who cannot speak a sentence in the usual way, can articulate perfectly well when he introduces a rhythmical movement, and sings it—or it may be that the movement of the finger distracts the attention of the individual from his speech, and allows a free action of the nerves concerned in articulation.

—THE PARKMAN MURDER AND THE TEXAS LETTER.—The *Houston* (Texas) *Mercantile Advertiser* of the 9th instant, has the following:

We notice in our exchanges that the Bostonians esteem the *Delta* letter on the Parkman murder a hoax. If the editor of the *Delta* has that letter in his possession, of which we think there is no doubt, the fact should not be passed lightly over. The news of the murder of Dr. Parkman, and of the arrest of Prof. Webster, arrived in this city on the 27th of December. The letter is dated on the 28th of December, and mailed at Washington, 60 miles from this city, on the most direct route to the interior.—News of the murder and arrest could not have reached Washington through the ordinary channels of intelligence at the

Poetry.

From The Literary World.

THE PRAYER OF LONELINESS.

"Gone—and for ever—from my yearning sight!"

Not where the cold grey dawn is slowly breaking
Do I most miss thee, loved one, from my side:
Though sad the memory, in that lonely waking,
Of smiles that once unto mine own replied.
Thy kiss upon my brow seems softly stealing,
There bursts from quivering lips a stifled moan,
The silence and the dawn are both revealing,
I am alone, alone

And when the twilight lingers, faintly fading,
The gloom will deepen likewise in my soul;
Remembrance of past joys, the present shading,
Grief yields to tears that mock my strong control.
Thy gentle hand seems lightly still caressing
The banded hair, so loved, so praised by thee;
Then as in days gone by, I hear thy blessing,
Breathed o'er me tenderly!

Midnight, with fearful dreams and wilder terror!
That dark and lonely vigil I must keep;
Sometimes awaking,—oh, most mournful error!—
With hope to find thee watching o'er my sleep.
Yet though such moments have a tender sorrow,
There is one pang—one grief—beyond them all;
A night of bitterness that knows no morrow,
Sweeps o'er me like a pall.

This thought, when standing by thy grave, is present;
That we are separate for Eternity,
Thy priceless love, that made life's paths so pleasant,
May be in thy new home withdrawn from me,—
That thou—so pure—wilt mark my sinful straying,
Looking with holy eyes on each intent,
To find when most my heart seems humbly praying,
Evil with good is blent.

And knowing souls impure may not inherit
The boon of "fear cast out by perfect love"—
That I, though striving faintly, may not merit
A home with thee in fairer worlds above,—
Turning from earth, and all its errors gladly,
Thy spirit weary of its fruitless care,
May leave me,—with white pinions drooping sadly—
To darkness and despair.

I pray thee linger!—listen to my pleading!
Oh, if the memory may to thee come,
Of the devotion which I gave, unheeding
My sorrow, and the blight of heart and home,—
The stern fulfilment of thy prayer in dying,
Which daily guides my life and fills my heart,—
If this can thrill thee, on my truth relying,
Thou can'st not so depart!

Oh, never leave me! For a while forsaking
The rest which thou in toil hast nobly won,—
Watch o'er me as of old, my sleep, my waking,
Till I with life's temptations shall have done;
The knowledge would so soothe this restless yearning,
To sleep beside thee, in the same still grave,
And blest thy mission unto earth returning
Thy wife, to shield, and save. N.

UP AND DOWN.

BY GOODWIN BARMBY.

Up! is the merry lark floating to sing
Its matins for joy to the sun of spring;
Down! is the bird of night winging to peer
For the mice in the barn-hole, dun and drear:
Up! is the beamy sun shining to give
Their verdure and hues to all flowers that live;
Down! is the gaping mine, lone, dark and cold,
Where the children of Mammon starve for gold:
Down! is the coward that slinketh to die;
Up! is the hero that looketh on high.

Up! is the calm of the clear and blue sky,
Far o'er the mountain-tops raising the eye;
Down! is the mist of the cultureless clod
Stooping the gaze to the sepulchre sod;
Up! is the watchman who tells of the night,
When beam the streaks of morn ruddy and bright;
Down! is the sluggard who keepeth his bed,
When morning's dews are all sprinkled and shed;
Down! is the coward who slumbers a slave;
Up! is the hero—the watchful and brave.

Up! is the patriot who raises mankind;
Up! is the poet—the eye of the blind;
Down! is the tyrant who maketh the slave;
Down! is the traitor—the door of the grave;
Up! is the high heaven of prophets of old—
The home of the saints, the meek and the bold;
Down is the hell of the bigot and vile—
The place of the bad with the Judas-smile;
Down! are the tyrant, the bigot, and slave;
Up! are the loving, the free, and the brave.

THE EVENING HYMN.

Another day, with mute adieu,
Has gone down yon untrodden sky;
And still it looks as clear and blue
As when it first was hung on high;
The sinking sun, the darkening cloud,
That drew the lightning in its rear,
The thunder, trumping deep and loud,
Have left no footmark there.

The village bells, with silver chime,
Come softened o'er the distant shore;
Though I have heard them many a time
They never rang so sweet before—
A silence rests upon the hill,
A listening awe pervades the air;
The very flowers are shut and still,
And bowed as if in prayer.

And in this hush'd and breathless close,
O'er earth, and air, and sky, and sea,
A still low voice in silence goes,
Which speaks alone, Great God, of Thee—
The whispering leaves, the far-off brook,
The linnet's warble fainter grown,
The hive-bound bee, the homeward rook,
All these their Maker own.

The deepening woods, the fading trees,
The grasshopper's last feeble sound,
The flowers just wakened by the breeze,
All leave the stillness more profound.
The twilight takes a deeper shade,
The dusky pathways darker grow,
And silence reigns in glen and glade,
While all is mute below.
And other eves as sweet as this
Will close upon as calm a day;
Then, sinking down the deep abyss,
Will, like the last, be swept away,
Until eternity is gained—
The boundless sea without a shore,
That without time forever reigned,
And will when time's no more.

Now nature sinks in soft repose,
A living semblance of the grave;
The dew steals noiseless on the rose,
The boughs have almost ceased to wave;
The silent sky, the sleeping earth,
Tree, mountain, stream, the humble sod—
All tell from whom they had their birth,
And cry, "Behold a God!"

—*Thomas Miller.*

O Liberty, thou goddess heavenly bright,
Profuse of bliss, and pregnant with delight!
Eternal pleasures in thy presence reign,
And smiling plenty leads thy wanton train:
Eas'd of her load, subjection grows more light,
And poverty looks cheerful in thy sight;
Thou mak'st the gloomy face of nature gay,
Giv'st beauty to the sun, and pleasure to the day.

—*Joseph Addison.*

Miscellany.

LORD JEFFREY.

[COMPILED FROM THE LONDON ATHENÆUM AND MORNING CHRONICLE.]

Francis Jeffrey, editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, and "one of the Judges of the Court of Session in Scotland," died at his seat called Craigcrook, near Edinburgh, on Saturday the 26th of January, in his 67th year. His judicial appointment gave him what in Scotland is called the "paper title" of a lord—in other words, a title by courtesy, one not recognized by the heralds, nor conferring any distinction on his issue, but restricted to himself. He will, however, be best remembered by his early name of Mr. Jeffrey—or as Lord Campbell would have written, plain Francis Jeffrey.

Thirty years ago—or even forty—the death of Mr. Jeffrey would have been a much more important subject for comment and conversation than it is now in a ripe old age. No critic ever filled—for good or for evil—a more important position in the world of letters that Mr. Jeffrey filled uninterruptedly for seven-and-twenty years in the literature of the nineteenth century. Whenever the history of English Literature shall be written, his name must always find a place; less prominent, it is true, than that which he occupied in his lifetime, but still one of distinction—not so much from the intrinsic value of his own contributions, as from the particular influence which his writings exercised on the public mind, and on the destinies, for a time, of some of our greatest poets.

The history of his life may be briefly told. He was the eldest son of George Jeffrey, Esq., one of the Court of Session in Scotland, by his wife, the daughter of a Mr. Loudoun, of Lanarkshire—and was born in Edinburgh, on the 23d of October, 1773. He was educated at the High School of his native city, and at Glasgow University, but completed his university education at Queen's College, Oxford. In 1794 he was called to the bar, where he soon became distinguished for the vigor of his eloquence and the wit and boldness of his invective. He attended debating clubs—spoke with readiness and knowledge; and with no other introduction than his own talents, formed the acquaintance, at the Speculative Society of Sir Walter Scott, then a young man, busy with his "Minstrelsey," and of the Rev. Sydney Smith and Lord Brougham, both ardent for distinction in the church and at the bar. Acquaintanceship soon ripened into intimacy; and at a late supper, after a debate at the Speculative Society, the *Edinburgh Review* was projected by Smith, and approved of by Jeffrey and Lord Brougham. Assistants were soon found; and in October, 1802, appeared the first number of the new periodical, under the editorial care of the Rev. Sydney Smith—its original projector, as he is called by Lord Jeffrey, "and long," he adds, "its brightest ornament."

The success of the new review was beyond the expectation of its founders,—and after a few numbers, beyond all precedent to publications of a similar nature. Nor is this to be wondered at when we look at the character and variety of its articles, and contrast its vigor and wit with the tame productions of any publication then at all approaching it in matter or in manner. The new review contained the views and thoughts, most fearlessly expressed, of a young and vigorous set of thinkers on some of the most important subjects of the day connected with politics, religion, jurisprudence and literature. The writers flew at all kinds of game;—nor was it difficult to see from the first (what was indeed obvious afterwards) that the politics of the Whig school gave a turn and color to the whole character of the Review. "The Review," said Jeffrey, "has but two legs to stand on; Literature, no doubt, is one of them—but its right leg is Politics."

Mr. Sydney Smith was the editor of the first three numbers; and would, no doubt, have continued his editorial care had not his views of promotion in the Church called him away from Edinburgh to London. On Mr. Smith's retirement, Mr. Jeffrey took his place; which he continued to fill without interruption till late in the year 1819, when he was elected to the office of Dean of the Faculty of Advocates—a judicial appointment of distinction at the Scottish Bar hardly to be held, it was thought, in conjunction with the editorship of a party Review. He continued, however, to write occasionally, not on politics it is understood—but on literary subjects, from which his judicial functions could not be held by any means to have excluded him.

His retirement from literature as a part of his profession gave him fresh opportunities of distinction in his original pursuit of the law, and in the line of politics to which he seems to have been especially partial. He was elected member of Parliament for his native city,—was listened to in the House more for his reputation's sake, and for what he might say, than for anything that he said, or for his manner of delivery:—and soon growing weary of attendance even in a "Reformed House" (to which he had so long looked forward, and which he had in a great measure contributed to bring about,) he asked from Lord Melbourne (1834) what he had long coveted—a seat on the Scottish Bench—received the appointment, and retired to Edinburgh and the beautiful scenery of Craigcrook.

He is described by an intelligent biographer as excelling "in acuteness, promptness, and clearness in the art of stating, illustrating and arranging—in extent of legal knowledge—in sparkling wit, keen satire, and strong and flowing eloquence." The same writer quoting a contemporary critic, the author of "Sketches of the Scottish Bar," says, "Ever quick, but never boisterous nor pushing, Jeffrey wound his way, like an eel, from one bar to the other. If what he had to do was merely a matter of form, it was despatched in as few words as possible; generally wound up, when circumstances permitted, with some biting jest. If a cause was to be formally argued, his bundle of papers was unloosed, his glass applied to his eye, and his discourse began, without a moment's pause. He plunged at once into the *mare magnum* of the question, confident that his train of argument would arrange itself in lucid order, almost without any exertion on his part. He possessed a most retentive memory, and could proceed from one subject to another at a moment's warning." The writer quotes the following anecdote of Lord Jeffrey, in his professional character:—As Mr. Jeffrey sat down one day, at the close of a long and argumentative speech, an attorney's clerk pulled him by the gown, and whispered in his ear, that a case in which he was retained had just been called on in the inner house. 'Good god,' said Jeffrey, 'I have heard nothing of the matter for weeks; and that trial has driven it entirely out of my head; what is it?'—The lad, in no small trepidation, began to recount some of the leading facts, but no sooner had he mentioned the first, than Jeffrey exclaimed, 'I know it,' and ran over, with the most inconceivable rapidity, all the details, and every leading case that bore upon them; and the speech he delivered on the occasion was the most powerful that ever fell from him." "His oratory," the same writer says, "is not commanding; and it is like the frog striving to stretch itself to the size of the ox when he attempts to be impressive; but once, indeed, says the writer before quoted, we remember an apostrophe, startling, nay commanding, from its native dignity and moral courage. A baronet having brought an action, in which, to gain his point, he had shown his disregard of all moral or honorable restraint, Mr. Jeffrey made the following observations on his conduct;—"My lords, there is no person who entertains a higher respect for the English aristocracy than I do, or who would be more loth to say anything which could hurt the feelings or injure the reputation of any one member of that illustrious body; but after all that we have this day heard, I feel myself warranted in saying [here he turned round, faced the plaintiff, who was immediately behind him, and fixing on him a cold firm look, proceeded in a low determined voice] that Sir —— has clearly shown himself to be a notorious liar and a common swindler."

A few further particulars of his life, in a notice brief as this must necessarily be, may not be thought unimportant. He was chosen, in 1821, Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow; was twice married, first to the daughter of the Rev. Dr. Wilson, of St. Andrew's—and secondly, to the daughter of Charles Wilkes, Esq. of New York, grand-niece of the famous Wiles "and liberty." Let us add (what future ages will no doubt care to know) that he was swarthy in countenance, and diminutive in stature

Lord Jeffrey is to be looked on as an editor and as an author, not as a Dean of Faculty or even as a Judge. "Envy must own" that he conducted the *Edinburgh Review* with admirable tact and skill—and that he showed great judgment as to the writers whom he brought about him. He was well supported by men like Sydney Smith, Mackintosh, Brougham, Horner, Allen, and Hazlitt. His subjects were well chosen for the time, and generally maintained consistent principles, both in politics and in taste; but his great object, it should not be concealed, was to attract attention and to draw readers. We are not, however, to tax him with all the editorial errors of the Review. Let us remember his own apologetical defence to Sir Walter Scott, that he was "a feudal monarch, who had but slender control over his greater barons, and really could not prevent them from occasionally waging little private wars upon griefs or resentments of their own."

Lord Jeffrey's position as an editor led him now and then into more than one unpleasant quarrel. Southey, Wordsworth, and Coleridge seldom spoke of him except in terms of hatred and contempt; and his memorable duel at Chalk Farm, in 1806, with Mr. More, partly occasioned by a clever application of a passage in Spenser to Tom Little's Poems, will long be remembered by the "Little's leadless pistol" of the "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers," and the contemporary epigram which ends

They only fire blank cartridge in Reviews.

The quarrels with the Lake Schools were never made up; but the author of Little's Poems, and the editor of the Edinburgh Review, were afterwards reconciled, and the critic even courted by a friendly dedication.

The great defect in Lord Jeffrey's editorship of the Edinburgh Review was his short-sightedness in appreciating the merits of Scott, Byron, Southey, Wordsworth, Coleridge, and others. He praised Scott for a time—but a cold notice of "Marmion" threw the future novelist into the arms of the Quarterly Review. The criticism on the "Hours of Idleness," though attributed to Mr. Jeffrey at the time, was, as is well known, written by Lord Brougham. Jeffrey himself afterwards praised Byron, and the noble poet was not ungrateful to the critic; witness his "Don Juan"—

All our little feuds, at least all mine,
Dear Jeffrey, once my most redoubted foe,
(As far as rhyme and criticism combine
To make such puppets of us things below,)
Are over: Here's a health to "Auld lang syne!"
I do not know you, and may never know
Your face—but you have acted on the whole
Most nobly, and I own it from my soul.

We cannot say of Byron on this occasion what has been said with propriety of another great satirist of our nation, that he was wanton in his attack and mean in his retreat. Mr. Jeffrey, in his capacity as editor, had given the young and noble poet great ground of provocation; and the satirist repaid censure with ferocious scorn—as afterwards he did praise from the same quarter with appropriate panegyric.

We are now to look on Lord Jeffrey as an author, and it is somewhat singular, we may observe, of one who has written so much, that he is not an author in any other sense than as a critic in a Review. This cannot be said of any of his leading associates, or of any of the opposition writers in the *Quarterly*,—or indeed of any other writer who has exercised one-half the influence in literature that Mr. Jeffrey possessed. His legal as well as his editorial duties must, it is true, have left him very little time for anything else: and we are not, perhaps, to suppose that he was without the ambition of being an author, or that he wanted leisure for the consideration of any subject of importance. We may attribute more justly his not appearing as an author in his own person to an unwillingness to endanger his high reputation by the production of a separate work, and to some fear of the "wounded great" who were ready to attack him on all sides and with every kind of weapon. He is, therefore to be judged by the four volumes of his "Essays," the contributions to the Review, which he was induced to collect and revise in the year 1843. These volumes, he tells us, form less than a third of what he wrote in the Review; but they, no doubt, embrace his best productions—those, in short, by which he was willing to stand. His friends would have made a somewhat different selection; one that would have represented the history of his mind and opinion—and that would have thrown more light on the history of critical judgment in this country than can be gathered from his volumes as they at present stand.

It is much to his praise as a man, though a little to his early discernment as a critic, that the bitter reviews of Southey, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and others were excluded from his 'Collected Essays;' while his eulogies on his favorite poets Campbell, Crabb and Rogers, were one and all admitted. He had outlived the resentment or impetuosity of youth with which they were written, as the great writers themselves had outlived the injury which their injustice had done to them; to have inserted them would therefore have only been renewing an unprofitable contest,—and connecting his name even more lastingly than it is likely to be with the great names of the writers whose hostility he both courted and incurred.

These 'Essays,' it must be confessed—and we have just risen from a re-perusal of some of the best—are not very remarkable productions. They are little distinguished for subtlety of opinion, nicety of acquisition, or even for beauty of style. Though praised uniformly with the contributions to the same review of Sydney Smith and Mr. Macaulay, they have not made the same impression on the public mind nor been read with the same avidity. So that, with the Essays of Mr. Smith and Mr. Macaulay are all in fourth editions—the public have been content till very recently with a single impression of Lord Jeffery. Yet his 'Essays' will more than pay perusal. His paper on Swift is the best elucidation of Mr. Dean's character that we have yet received: while his articles on Penn and the Quakers exhibit qualities of mind not easily to be found in authors of equal or greater celebrity.

One of the last acts of Lord Jeffrey's life was to write a long—and, as we hear, a beautiful letter of thanks to the widow of the Rev. Sydney Smith, and the copy of Sydney Smith's Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution and privately printed by his widow. Lord Jeffrey, it will be remembered, dedicates the 'Essays' to his friend Smith.

SINGULAR MEETING OF THIEVES.

A meeting of unprecedented character was held at the British Union Scool-room, Shaspeare-walk, Shadwell, on Monday evening. It was convened by the Metropolitan Correspondent of the *Chronicle*, for the purpose of assembling together some of the lowest class of male juvenile thieves and vagabonds who infest the metropolis and the country at large; and although privately called, at only two day's notice, by the distribution of tickets of admission among the class in question at the various haunts and dens of infamy to which they resort, no fewer than 150 of them attended on the occasion. At first their behavior was very noisy and disorderly, but before the close they became peaceful and even respectful in their demeanor. 19 had fathers and mothers still living; 39 had only one parent; and eighty were orphans in the fullest sense of the word, having neither father or mother alive. Of professed beggars there were 50, and 66 who acknowledged themselves to be habitual thieves. The announcment that the greater number present were thieves pleased them exceedingly, and was received "with three rounds of applause.

When it was announced that one, though only nineteen years of age, had been in prison as many as twenty-nine times, the clapping of hands, the catcalls, and shouts of "brayvo;" lasted for several minutes, and the whole of the boys rose to look at the distinguished individual. Some chalked on their hats the figures which designated the sum of the several times that they had been in gaol.

The boys were interrogated as to their manner of life, &c., and their answers should be read by all who are engaged in the work of Ragged Schools.—Our limited space will not allow of much extract.

A lad of about twenty was about to volunteer a statement concerning the lodging-houses, by which he declared he had been brought to his ruin, but he was instantly assailed with cries of "come down!" "hold your tongue!" and these became so general, and were in so menancing a tone, that he said he was afraid to make any disclosures, because he believed if he did so he would have perhaps some ten or a dozen of the other chaps on to him (great confusion).

The Correspondent of the *Chronicle*: Will it hurt any of you here if he says anything against the lodging-houses—(yes, yes)? How will it do so?

A Voice: They will not allow stolen property to come into them if it is told.

Correspondent: But would not all of you gladly quit your present course of life—(yes, yes)? Then why not have the lodging-house system, the principal cause of all your misery, exposed?

A Voice: If they shut up the lodging-houses, where are we to go? If a poor boy gets to the workhouse he catches a fever, and is starved into the bargain.

Correspondent: Are you not all tired of the lives you now lead [vociferous cries of "yes, yes we wish to better ourselves," from all parts of the room]?—However much you dread the exposure of the lodging-houses, you know, my lads, as well as I do, that it is in them that you meet your companions, and ruin, it not begun there, is at least completed in such places. If a boy runs away from his home he is encouraged there and kept secreted from his parents. And do not the parties who keep these places grow rich on your degradation and peril—[loud cries of "yes, yes]? Then why don't you all come forward now, and, by exposing them to the public, who know nothing of the iniquities and vice practised in such places, put an end to these dens at once? There is not one of you here—not one, at least, of the elder boys—who has found out the mistake of his present life, who would not, I verily believe, become honest and earn his living by his industry, if he could. You might have thought a roving life a pleasant thing enough at first, but you know now that a vagabond's life is full of suffering, care, peril, and privation; you are not so happy as you thought you would be, and are tired and disgusted with your present course. This is what I hear from you all. Am I not stating the fact—[renewed cries of "yes, yes, yes;" and a voice: "The fact of it is, sir, we don't see our folly till it is too late"]? Now I and many hundreds and thousands really wish you well, and would gladly do anything we could to get you to earn an honest living. All, or nearly all, your misery, I know, proceeds from the low lodging-houses [yes, yes, it does master! it does]; and I am determined, with your help, to effect their utter destruction [a voice, "I am glad of it, sir, you are quite right; and I pray God to assist you"].

The elder boys were then asked what they thought would be the best mode of effecting their deliverance from their present degraded position.—Some thought emigration the best means, for if they started afresh in a new colony they said they would leave behind them their bad characters, which closed every avenue to employment against them at home. Others thought there would be difficulties in obtaining work in the colonies in sufficient time to prevent their being driven to support themselves by their old practices. Many again thought the temptations which surrounded them in England rendered their reformation impossible; whilst many more considered that the same temptation would assail them abroad that existed at home.

During the course of the proceedings one of the most desperate characters present, a boy who had been twenty-six times in prison, was singled out from the rest, and a sovereign given him to get changed, in order to make the experiment whether he would have [the honesty to return the change or abscond with it in his possession. He was informed on receiving it, that if he chose to decamp with it no proceedings should be taken against him. He left the room amid the cheers of his companions, and when he had been absent a few moments all eyes were turned toward the door each time it opened, anxiously expecting his return to prove his trust worthiness. Never was such interest displayed by any body of individuals. Many mounted the forms in their eagerness to obtain the first glimpse of his return. It was clear that their honor was at stake; and several said they would kill the lad if he made away with the money. Many minutes elapsed in almost breathless suspense, and some of his companions began to say that so large a sum of money had proved too great a temptation for the boy. At last, however, a tremendous burst of cheering announced the lad's return. The delight of his companions broke forth again and again in long and loud peals of applause, and the youth advanced amidst triumphant shouts to the platform, and gave up the money in full.—*Inquirer.*

THE RABBIT BREEDING WOMAN, AND THE COCKLANE GHOST.

Those of the readers of the *Evening Post* who read our introductory remarks, on Monday, on the subject of the Rochester ghosts, will now, we trust, be obliging enough to accompany us for a few moments to Godalming and Cocklane.

In 1726, a woman named Mary Totts, living at Godalming, in the country of Surrey, England, "of a healthy constitution, small size, fair complexion and sullen temper, unable to read or write," confessed to her female friends with much reluctance, that she was constantly giving birth to rabbits. The story began to spread, and was so well confirmed by *facts* that it attracted the attention, not only of the neighbors, but of the medical faculty at a distance. Of course, precisely as in the case of the Rochester ghosts, the truth of her assertion being admitted readily, the great puzzle was to explain the causes of this "monstrous deviation from the laws of nature." The woman herself could not explain them, except by stating that being in a delicate situation, she had seen some rabbits in a field, and tried in vain to catch them. Another woman who was present, and was an important witness in the affair, testified that she had—what? charged Mary Tofts with longing for the aforesaid rabbits. Mary also admitted that she had dreamed about rabbits, and so, this unfortunate tendency had come upon her.

Strange at this story was, it was fully believed, and when a highly respectable physician, Mr. Howard, of thirty years experience, was called in to assist her during these strange deliveries, and certified that in the course of one month, he had acted as accoucher to thirty rabbits, the sceptical began to yield their opposition, and the believers increased rapidly in numbers. So great a noise did the circumstances create, that George I. became personally interested in the inquiry, and sent his own surgeon, Dr. Ahlers, to inquire into the subject. The Dr. made a personal examination of the case, became satisfied of the truth of the extraordinary reports, and went back to London, not only convinced himself, but with the intention of obtaining a pension for the luckless Mary. The king then sent Dr. St. Andre, his surgeon and anatomist, also to investigate the affair. He too returned thoroughly convinced. He even carried back with him some of the very rabbits, which were duly dissected before his Majesty, and found to be rabbits and nothing else. An official account was then published by him, and of course it produced a very high state of excitement in the public mind. A controversy arose between the believers and the unbelievers, and the celebrated Whiston wrote a pamphlet, asserting that the miracle was in strict accordance with a prophecy of Esdras. On the other hand, Hogarth attacked the friends of Mary Tofts, most effectively, in social caricatures. Still the delusion sped, and with such effect, that few persons would any longer eat rabbits, from a feeling of disgust. The rents of rabbit warrens fell to nothing. In short, there was a general impression of the truth of the story, when the then Princess of Wales took the matter in hand. Mary was brought up to London and closely watched by Sir Richard Manningham, an eminent physician, and even he came very near being imposed upon, until he proposed a very dangerous operation, in order to relieve her. This alarmed her so much that she confessed the trick, explained how it was carried on, and named the party who supplied her with rabbits. She also confessed that she had expected to get assistance from the public, so that she would not be obliged to work for a living. Mary was committed to Tothillfield Bridewell for a short time, and rabbits continued to breed in the usual manner.

In 1762, the Cocklane ghost made its appearance in London. At the house of a Mr. Parsons, the pious parish clerk of St. Sepulchre's, alarming knockings and scratchings were heard by his daughter, an artless child, only twelve years of age. On being closely questioned, she admitted, that she had not only heard these noises, but had seen the apparition of a Mrs. Kent, formerly a lodger in the house reported to have died of the small pox after she had left it, but believed to have been murdered. The rumor spread like wild fire, and as it is always the credulous who first assemble to witness the supernatural, crowds of believers gathered at the Parish Clerk's! The knockings and scratchings became more violent, as the number of believers increased. A clergyman was selected among others to sit at the bed side of Miss Parsons, to converse with or exercise the ghost, as the case might be. He informed the ghost, in a loud voice, that its answers if in the affirmative, should be indicated by one knock, and if in the negative, by two knocks. The arrangement being concluded, the ghost was asked if it was the spirit of the murdered Mary Kent, and it answered with one knock. This heightened the public anxiety, and directly she was removed from her home, to several houses in succession, and attended night after night, by watchers and committees embracing, all the learned professions, and a number of ladies. The knockings continued, no one could account for them, and the faithful asked. If there is an imposture, explain how these knockings are made? Even Dr. Johnson, became a champion of the ghost. The sequel of the affair in thus described by the historian:

"At length, on being pressed to give some proof of its veracity, the ghost consented to attend one of the gentlemen into the vault where the body was buried, and manifest its presence by a knock upon the coffin.

"When the appointed hour arrived, 'the spirit was very seriously advertised, that the person to whom the promise was made of striking the coffin, was then about to visit, and that the performance of the promise was then claimed. The company, at one, went into the church, and the gentleman to whom the promise was made, went, with one more, into the vault. The spirit was solemnly required to perform its promise, but nothing more than silence ensued. The person supposed to be accused by the ghost then went down, with several others, but no effect was perceived. Upon their return they examined the girl, but could draw no confession from her. Between two and three she desired, and was permitted, to go home with her father.'

"This want of punctuality in the ghost gave a fatal blow to its reputation. Even the most besotted of the believers were staggered by it. A flimsy attempt, was, therefore, made to restore the ghost's credit, by asserting that the coffin and corpse had been removed, which, of course, had prevented the spirit from giving the signal; but, on examination, they were found to be safe in the vault. Stricter precautions were now taken to guard against deception being practised by the girl; her bed was slung like a hammock, in the middle of the room, and she was closely watched. Driven to her last shifts, she contrived to secrete, but not unseen, a bit of board previously to her being put to bed, and having, as she thought, secured the necessary materials for carrying on the trick, she ventured to declare that she would bring the ghost at six the next morning. In the morning she accordingly began to make the accustomed sounds, and, on being asked if she had in the bed any wood to strike upon, she positively denied the fact. The bed-clothes were then opened, the board was found, and this simple process annihilated the Cocklane Ghost.

"Mr. Kent, the accused person, had, in the meanwhile, proved his innocence, by certificates from the physician and apothecary who attended upon the deceased female. The base attack upon his character appears to have been prompted by revenge. While lodging with Parsons he had lent him some money, which, after much forbearance, he was compelled to recover by a suit at law. The malignant offender, however, did not escape punishment; he with others who had lent themselves to his imposture, being ultimately brought to trial, and found guilty of a conspiracy."

It is a curious circumstance, that the mysterious noises heard at the house of Mr. Fox, in Arcadia, (part and parcel of the knockings at Rochester,) were of a similar character. They established, if anything, the murder of a pedlar some years ago; and the burial of his body in the cellar of that house.—The believers began to dig for the bones, but having worked for a few minutes gave up the search, relying on the verity of the ghost's statements, rather than on the demonstration of the pick-axe. The questions asked, were asked by persons who for years before had suspected a certain party of having committed the crime, as that party was compelled to get his neighbors to certify that he had always borne the character of an honest man. He fell into suspicion, because an old maid found his wife altering two coats for him, which she refused to account for to the inquirer's satisfaction! XX.

—*Evening Post.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

Release of Dr. Achill.—This gentleman has been set at liberty by the Cardinals, and is at present in Paris.

—The *Presse* says that there were 364 trees of liberty in Paris, and that they have all been cut down, with the exception of 37. Among those cut down was one which was planted in 1793.

—Terry Driscoll (*Dublin Warder*) describes Shakespeare as the greatest play-writer that ever put the finger nails to his head when he wanted a word

—Death of Lady Brewster.—We regret to have to announce the demise of Lady Brewster, wife of Sir David Brewster, who expired on Sunday last at Edinburgh. This estimable lady was youngest daughter of the late Dr. James Macpherson, of Bellville, and married Sir David in 1810.

—"The coroner of Bristol," says the London *Weekly News*, "held an inquest upon the the bones of a couple of Cavaliers or Roundheads, slain at the siege of the city by Prince Rupert in 1643, having been turned up by some "navvies," and the jury returned an unimpeachable verdict of "Found dead."

—Weight of the Human Brain.—The brain of Cuvier weighed 64 1-2 oz.; this was the largest on record. That of Dr. Abercrombie was 63 oz.; that of Dupuytren, a celebrated surgeon of France, 63 1-2 oz.; Dr. Chalmers, 58 oz. (skull very thick,) Sir Walter Scott, not large, perhaps average, but not weighed; Lord Byron, 58 oz.

—"A County Elector" states in the *Oxford Chronicle*: "Not many days since, speaking to the hopeful son of a peer of the realm (the son now studying at the university) of the weight of taxation, and the distress among the farmers and the industrious classes generally, what was his reply? We will lower the rent and take off some of the taxes! O dear no, nothing so vulgar: "We want a d——d good war to take off the rifraff.'"

—"The inhabitants of the village of Kingsweare," says the *Western Times*, "have a church-rate of 8s. in the pound, to defray the expense of repairing the church, which has only been built two years, but is unfit for worship on account of dry rot."—The dry rot in the church—'we, *Weekly News*, don't allude to the mere timber of the material structure—has been long complained of.'

—The ex-King of the French, Louis Philippe, says a London paper, is in the enjoyment of excellent health, and the health of his amiable consort is also exceedingly satisfactory. Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess de Nemours, and the Duke and Duchess d'Aumale and children, are at Claremont; and a select number of friends of the exiled royal family are with the count and countess at Claremont.

—Another Arctic Expedition.—The Lords of the Admiralty, on obtaining the sanction of the House of Commons, have lost no time in deciding on the plan to be adopted for another expedition to proceed in the direction of Davis's Straits, Lancaster Sound, and onwards to Melville Island, in search of Captain Sir John Franklin, and the officers and crews of the Erebus and Terror; and an express messenger was dispatched from the Admiralty on Tuesday afternoon to Woolwich with orders to Commodore Henry Eden to get the Acorn, 12, sloop, and Minx steam-vessel, ready for sea at the shortest notice. The messenger was also bearer at the same time of despatches for Captain Sir John Hill, superintendent of the victualling yard, Depford, to have the necessary provisions ready to be sent to Woolwich and put on board these vessels. The Acorn is at present at Chatham, but she can soon be brought round to Woolwich, and made ready for sea. The Minx is a steam-vessel propelled by the screw, and the last trial she had when fitted with the disc engines gave a remarkably favorable result, and with a very small consumption of fuel—an object of the greatest importance in a voyage to the Arctic regions. The disc engine has since been tried for a considerable number of hours consecutively, and found to continue to work well, without being liable to get out of order, and appears to be in every way adapted for the undertaking the Minx is now ordered to be employed upon, if their lordships should decide on using those engines now on board the vessel.—*Weekly Times.*

—"A Tale of Beef Tea."—A Scotch minister, who cared about no sublinary things (except now and then a visionary tale of bawbees might cross his mind), on one occasion being taken seriously ill, called in the doctor, and admonishing him first "not to draw a lang bill, for he couldna afford it," asked him the nature of his complaint. After feeling the parson's pulse, looking at his tongue, tapping his chest, &c., the doctor declared that he was starving himself. "Lord, doctor," said the minister, "ye're a witch; for Jeannie (his housekeeper) gaed awa twa days sine, and I've no had a pickle of brose since!" "Why minister, man, ye maun have some beef tea." "Lord, doctor, I hae nae tea in the house, nor beef either; ye maun be a feul to think o' finding any here." "Weel, weel, minister, I'll sen' ye some beef tea doun." "Na, na, doctor, ye'll put it in the bill." "Minister, I'll send it doon free o' charge, and mind ye tak it." The docter sent down the beef tea, and next day called to see how his patient was getting on. "Weel, minister, how are ye the day?"—"Hegh, man! I'm awfu' bad; of a' the pheesick I ever tuk in my life, the beef tea beats a'. Why, man, it wadna stay wi' me ava: it made me worse than ony mittick." Why, minister, I'll try the tea mysel." So putting some in a skillet, he warmed it, tasted it, and told the minister it was excellent. "Man," says the minister, "is that the way ye sup it?" "What ither way should it be suppit? It's excellent, I say, minister." "It may be gude that way, doctor, but try it wi' the cream and sugar, man! try it wi' that, and then see how ye like it? It is needless to say how the doctor laughed at the simple minister fancying that all tea should be taken with cream and sugar.

—Cold.—The cold was so intense in Khamtschatka about the end of December that the governor of the province was compelled to leave his customary residence at Petropawlosk, and retire to his subterraneous palace of Tschewskoi. This abode, which is built about twenty metres under ground, affords accommodation for the governor and his suite, comprised of two hundred persons. It contains all the necessary comforts of ordinary life; its temperature is mild and salubrious; the absence of daylight is supplied by a number of lamps which are constantly burning. It seldom occurs that the weather is so severe as to compel the governor to take refuge at Tschewski, but when such is the case, he generally passes two entire months, sometimes three, in that residence. The wealty inhabitants of the country take up their quarters in similar abodes.—*Times.*

—George Sand.—Madame Dudevant has lately been much annoyed by the incessant attention paid to her by the Parisian police, and a report was circulated that she had been ordered to quit Paris. In a letter to the *Presse*, she stated the fact which probably gave rise to this story. "M. Carlier, (the Prefect of Police), tormented by the police of my *chef lieu de canton* which has fallen into a chronic state of *malepene*, as we call it in my country, and perhaps, feeling on that day a want of a belief in a conspiracy, sought for my address in Paris. I sent it to him by one of my friends, thinking it my duty to reply to one act of politeness by another. I could not attribute to any other motive than a wish to pay me a visit the pains which the Prefect of Police took to discover my place of abode."

—John Knox's House.—A meeting of the subscribers to the Knox monument was recently held. The steps which had been taken for the preservation of the reformer's house, under the superintendence of Mr. James Smith, architect, had been completely successful, though funds were still required for putting the house in such a state as would be worthy of the public and of the great reformer Mr. Jaffray stated in detail the design of the committee, in regard to the house, to be to preserve it in all time coming as a separate building, with a person residing in it, who might keep it in order and show it to the public, the reformer's study and the room in which he died being more particularly held sacred to his memory.

—"There is a passage in Longinus (ch. xxii.)," says "A. W." in *Notes and Queries*, "which indicates that the fact of the circulation of the blood was well established in the days of Plato. The father to critics, to exemplify and illustrate the use and value of trope in writing, has garbled from the 'Timæus,' a number of sentences descriptive of the anatomy of the human body, where the circulation of the blood pointed at in terms singularly graphic."

—We (*Glasgow Examiner*) trust that some independent member will, as soon as Parliament meets, move for a return stating how much, including interest and compound interest, the illegitimate children of Charles II., and their descendants have cost this country, and what they are still receiving. It ought to be the peculiar province of the bishops to protest against this perpetuated premium to royal peccadillos, and we should be charmed to hear any one of them rise in the House of Lords and question the Christianity of a country which grants and pays pensions for the breaking of the commandments.

—The *London Inquirer* tells the following tale of intolerance in Liverpool:

Last week, a man named Stowfort was placed at the bar of the Liverpool Police Court, on the complaint of Mr. Parkinson, publican. On Sunday evening there were a number of captains and mates of American vessels in his house, and in a back room there was a black man sitting quietly with his friends. The prisoner intimated to some of the mates and others around him that there was a black man in the house. Several parties (Americans) went into the room, and the black man was ejected with some little violence. A general fight and squabble then took place, and glasses and jugs were thrown about. One of the glasses was "fired" at Mr. Parkinson, and wounded him on the head, so that he came into court with a bandage round it. The black man being called, said his name was Brown, and that he made a living by exhibiting wax-work figures. The prisoner, on entering the room in which he (witness) sat, cried out to him, "Come out of this; we will have no negroes here." Mr. Rushton said the disturbance arose from the prejudice entertained in the United States against blacks. Because a man with a colored skin was in an adjoining room he was to be ejected and maltreated, and a riot created. Such conduct would